

SLOVAKIA

VOL. IX

JUNE-DECEMBER, 1959

NO. 5 (30)



IN THIS ISSUE:

SLOVAKIA UNDER COMMUNISM

SLOVAKIA'S ACCESSION TO THE TRIPARTITE PACT

SLOVAKIA AND THE CHURCH

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL JUSTICE

SLOVAK NATIONALISM:

NATIONALISM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

FATHER SEGINAK'S IMPRESSION OF PRAGUE AND PREŠOV
THE KREMLIN HAS SHOWN ITS HAND

ELEVEN HUNDRED YEARS OF PRAYERFUL SONG

STEPHEN OSUSKÝ AND MARCH 1939

OSUSKÝ AFTER MARCH 14, 1939

THE HISTORY OF SLOVAKIA

WHO SAID IT: 19, 37, 64, 68

* * *

Edited and compiled by
PHILIP A. HROBAK

SLOVAKIA
Box 150
Middletown, Pa.

* * *

Published by
THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

RECOMMENDED BOOKS:

THIS IS SLOVAKIA, Hrušovský; \$1.00.

THE SLOVAKS, Yurchak; paper cover \$2.00; cloth \$3.00.

SKETCHES FROM SLOVAK HISTORY, Škultéty; \$1.00 (paper); \$2.00 (cloth cover).

THE DELIVERANCE OF SISTER CECILIA, \$3.75.

THE CHURCH OF SILENCE IN SLOVAKIA, Zúbek; \$3.50.

FALSE FREEDOM, Delaney; \$2.00.

SLOVAKIA'S ROAD TO STATEHOOD, Woytko; \$1.50.

"CZECHOSLOVAKIA" — History Made to Order, Hrobák; 50c.

UNCONQUERABLES, Paučo; \$3.50

LUDOVÍT ŠTÚR AND HIS PLACE IN THE SLAVIC WORLD,
Prof. J. Kirschbaum; 25c.

ANTHOLOGY OF SLOVAK POETRY, Kramoriš; \$2.00.



SLOVAKIA is published periodically by the Slovak League of America, a cultural and civic federation of Americans of Slovak descent.

The main purpose of SLOVAKIA is to promote a better understanding and appreciation of the Slovak nation and its long, hard struggle for freedom and independence.

\$1.00 per annum in the U. S. A. — \$2.00 elsewhere.

SLOVAKIA

P. O. Box 150

Middletown, Pa.

Printed in the U. S. A.

JEDNOTA PRESS

Middletown, Pa.

SLOVAKIA

Published by the Slovak League of America

VOL. IX

JUNE-DECEMBER, 1959

NO. 5 (30)

SLOVAKIA UNDER COMMUNISM

Joseph Paučo

In the past two years hundreds of American Slovaks visited Slovakia. They were not molested or harmed in any way; and no one was arrested or detained by the police that we know of. It is obvious that Prague wants visitors from America, because that means American DOLLARS.

Only two Slovak clergymen were allowed to visit Slovakia, though many more applied for visas but were refused them. The Czech Reds do not want Slovak Catholic priests from America to visit Slovakia. And most well-known Slovak personalities in America, too, are persona non grata. They want to know too much about the plight of the Church in Slovakia, the condition of the Bishops and the clergy and the schools.

I have talked with dozens of Americans of Slovak origin who have visited Slovakia. This report is based on these conversations.

After World War II, a certain Slovak came to America to his father. This year he was allowed to visit Slovakia. He had let his brothers and other relatives know that he was coming. So they waited for him at the station. And they waited and waited in the crowd for some time. He did not recognize them, and they did not recognize him. "We had not

seen each other for thirteen years," he related. "My brother and brother-in-law have changed beyond recognition."

"My brother," he continued, "is younger than I, but today he looks older than our father. He has aged terribly; he is wrinkled and gray. He is not the same man I said goodbye to in Slovakia thirteen years ago."

What did he go through? They confiscated his property, as well as that of the other relatives. A nephew, a priest, is languishing somewhere in a concentration camp, while his two sisters — members of a religious order — are forced to work in the fields. The family is large and there is no money, or any way of earning it, that is, enough of it to keep going. The spiritual and material property of these people is indescribable. No wonder the man aged prematurely!

"During my stay in Slovakia," continued my friend, "not a single smile ever lit up the faces of my relatives. We all cried when my brother related what terrible things had transpired since the end of the war. And they all cry even when they eat and sleep."

He met with his friends in the village. When he left them thirteen years ago, they were well off. Today they have nothing. All

must work in the kholkhoses. All are aging prematurely; all are beggars today. "They walk in rags," said my friend, "like the gypsies used to long ago."

"I never felt so depressed in all my life," he continued. "These people have virtually lost all faith in themselves. In their great fear and sorrow they care for nothing; nothing interests them. They pray constantly, and it is prayer that keeps them from despairing. I certainly would not want to live in Slovakia today," concluded my friend.

Farmers in Slovakia are losing their land. The Czech Communist State is confiscating it systematically. The State now owns most of the farmers and their farms. The farmers, sooner or later, are forced to join the kholkhose system or they lose everything. In the end they do lose everything. Here is the story as told by an American with a brother in Slovakia, who "voluntarily" joined the collective farm system.

My brother owned 12 hectares of land (29.64 acres). He was obliged to give the government annually 2,640 lbs. of beef, 1,000 lbs. of pork, 8,360 lbs. of grain, 350 eggs, and 2,500 liters of milk. If the season was dry and crops were poor, or the animals got sick and died, the farmer was lost. He had no money with which to buy grain, meat, eggs, or milk. And even if he had money, he could not buy anything, because the other farmers, too, had to surrender their products. What could he do but surrender his land to the State?

To get the farmers to join the kholkhose system, the Reds promised just about everything to have the farmers join "voluntari-

ly." When this did not work out very well, the Reds began to use pressure. First on the wealthier farmers, whom they labeled parasites, blood-sucker, and political unreliables. After their holdings were diminished "by law," the Reds began to work on the small farmers. They gave them a "choice": either to give up their own farms and work on the kholkhoses, or to lose everything and work the same amount of acreage somewhere else. In the end the entire community is changed. The farmers have nothing left but a garden which cannot sustain the family. People get paid for working in the kholkhoses. Not in money, but in "units." A unit is worth 6 crowns (85 cents) and three kilograms (6.6 lbs.) of grain. But to earn this unit, the kholkhose slave must, for example, cultivate cucumbers or tobacco six hours. The value of the "unit" is figured otherwise for different jobs.

Kholkhose guards are also paid in units. Daily they get one and a half units, that is, 9 crowns (\$1.28) and 4.50 kilograms (9.90 lbs.) of grain. But the guard not only watches and supervises, but also must work.

A farmer's cow is worth 110 units to the State, that is, he must pay with his work 666 crowns (\$95.14) and give 330 kilograms (726 lbs. of grain. This means that a farmer must buy his own cow annually or else lose it. In the summer the cows have a common pasture; in the winter they are fed from the kholkhoses. A milker has to take care of 16 cows. He milks the cows by hand three times daily. Everything is systematized. Each person works in his own department only. With a whip over his head at all times. People must

work Sundays, too, so that the Reds can show that they completely control the "reactionary peasants," who have always been faithful to God and to their nation. Today practically everything is owned by the State — business, industry, bakeries, butcher shops, drugstores, farms, and even the doctors. Everything is owned by all the people. "Everything is ours, but only to look at," is what the people say in Slovakia.

* * *

I asked several American Slovaks who had visited Slovakia recently, how the Church fared in Slovakia and how the priests were treated. I was told that many priests still are in jail and that those who are not are under strict police control. The Czech Red secret police and their agents shadow every clergyman. I then asked about the priests who had signed the government program in regard to "Catholic Action," and those who had refused to sign it. The number of those who pledged loyalty to the government program was negligible. About half of the latter have already regretted their action. Those who refused to sign have to live a hell on earth. The Communists spread malicious rumors about them to turn their parishioners against them. Where that happens the churches remain empty and then the Reds chase the priests to the labor camps, saying that they have nothing to do in the parish. Of course, Sundays mean nothing to the Reds. People must devote Sundays to put time in the "work brigades." This means that people cannot go to church — and in turn "the priest has nothing to do!" This in time will have telling effects. Since the Greek Catholic churches

are now administered by orthodox clergymen from Russia and Bohemia the Slovak Greek Catholics (Byzantine Rite) attend Roman Catholic churches even if they have to walk miles to get to one. The Catholics are becoming thus more united in suffering and in their opposition to the Reds.

When I asked recent visitors to Slovakia how fares it with the schools there, I was told that the teachers must sign a statement that they have renounced the Catholic Faith or else they lose their positions. "The future of Communism," the Reds keep on bellowing, "depends on the training of our youth." And God and religion must be eradicated from the hearts and minds of all youngsters no matter what the cost, according to the Reds.

The Slovaks feel that they have been forsaken by all except God. To Him they turn constantly for help, praying that another war soon breaks out. Yes, in their great affliction they are begging God to allow another war, because they feel that the Reds will never let up unless they are beat up. The Slovaks are now hardened and determined to fight. They tried to help the Magyars when they revolted in 1956, but Red Prague stopped them with its armies. If America or the West had come to the aid of the Magyars at that time, the Slovaks over there say that they, the Poles, Ukrainians, Rumanians, and the other behind the Iron Curtain would also have made a bid for freedom — and the situation today in central and eastern Europe would be different than it is. They still ask why America and the West did not help. And if they did not help in 1956, what are the chances of help from

America and the West the next time some nation makes a bid to burst from its Red chains? Who has the heart to tell them that America and the West have decided on a policy of "peaceful coexistence"? Of course, not Radio Free Europe or the Voice of America — but the Reds will, and they did tell them: "Don't expect any help from the American imperialists. Comrade Nikita Khruschev is the only one now that can help. Stick by him!"

* * *

How about the cost of living in Slovakia? Terribly high. Breakfast — a very small piece of butter, a little jam, two pieces of bread and a cup of coffee — come to 12 crowns (7 crowns = one dollar). Lunch — pork and sauerkraut, bread, and a small beer — adds up to 17.50 crowns. A kilogram (2.2 lbs.) of tomatoes — 12 crowns; 3 lbs. of bread — 8 crowns — a liter of vodka — 80 crowns; a liter of rum — 96 crowns; a kilogram of sugar — 10.20; poor quality sausage — 25 crowns per kilogram; better quality — 80 crowns; women's dress material — 400 crowns (per dress) and to sew same another 300 crowns; men's suits — 1,200 crowns; work shoes — 200, and dress shoes — 380 crowns. There are cheaper shoes, but they last only about 2-3 weeks of continuous wear; the better shoes last about six months.

Thus a person must work two weeks to buy poor clothes. Factory workers are a bit better off. But even an expert or technician does not make more than 1,400 crowns per month. A tractor man gets 1,200 crowns per month. A commander of the National Security is no better off.

How about getting food and

clothes from America? They were getting quite a bit of help from American relatives at first, but since "Care" was proscribed and the government has taken over everything, little is coming in, because of exorbitant taxes or customs duty. A headkerchief (babuška) from America for example, is taxed 50 crowns (\$7.15), and other articles of wear as high as 200 crowns per kilogram!

A Slovak lady, who had visited Slovakia recently, told of her surprise when she bought some meat at a butcher shop and some buns at a bakery. The clerk would not wrap the merchandise. When she asked for wrapping paper, she was told to bring her own next time or wrap her stuff in an apron.

How about buying an auto in Slovakia? Well, they are offered for sale, but not for everybody or anybody. The prices are exorbitant, but then it's not so easy to get one even if one has the cash. A request form for an auto must first be filled out and sent to the proper authorities. It may take up to three years to get an answer. But that does not mean that one is ready to get the auto. The reply usually tells the applicant what further steps he must take.

It's the same thing, my informant tells me, with building one's home. First he must get permission to build; then he waits till he gets an approval for the necessary material. He may ask for a certain kind of material and get another kind.

"You know," my informer told me, "in Slovakia they have plenty of everything — poverty, fear, jails, drudgery — except money and fabricated materials. Many

times I could not even buy matches in a Slovak village. And when I walked into a store and asked what they had to sell, one 'comrade' replied sourly: 'Don't ask what we have, but what we don't have!'

* * *

Visitors to Slovakia are generally surprised at the excessive drinking of the ordinary folks. "I visited five communities," a friend of mine told me after returning from Slovakia, "but the drinking problem is the same in all of them, and, I suppose, in all of Slovakia." The Slovaks drink not because they are well off, but because they are suffering extreme hardships. It seems that the people there are trying to drink their hapless lot away. "But the stuff they are drinking," added my friend, "is terrible stuff, poison that most people themselves make clandestinely. Perhaps it is worse than the worst moonshine ever made in America." The clergy are doing their best to convince the people not to drink, but to little avail. More than one priest told me that the situation is worsening with the years.

* * *

Shadowing visitors is common in Slovakia. I learned from several friends who recently visited Slovakia that the secret police of any district know who is coming from where into the area. My friend, let's call him Janko (John), recently visited his relatives, and he had quite a few of them. "As I left the home of one of my relatives for the home of another," said Janko, "I became aware of the fact that somebody was following me. Well, the first time it did not bother me. But I noticed the same fel-

low shadowing me for several days. When I entered the home of my aunt, the man slipped out of sight. The next morning he reappeared again. On this occasion he approached me and said:

"Pardon me, but I think you are looking for the home of your friend's mother, not — the friend that lives in the same town in America that you do? Well, his mother lives over there."

"Surprised? Of course, I was," continued Janko. "I had told no one that I was going to visit my friend's mother, because he had asked me not to, since he was a public official. But the shadow evidently knew whom I would probably visit in that particular village! When I visited some relatives and friends in another town, I was shadowed again."

* * *

Another American visitor visited the pastor of the parish to which his relatives belong. "How are you, Father?" he asked. "Oh, I'm getting along fine, thank you. So fine, in fact, that things could hardly be better. And briefly, let me tell you how fine:

"Last Sunday I gave a sermon and then celebrated Holy Mass. As I left the church, a well-known Communist official approached me and asked me to repeat the sermon I gave since he did not have time to attend church, because, he said, he wanted to be edified.

"Yes, he did want to learn something. He wanted to hear from my own lips what I had said so that he could check this with the report that would be brought to him by his own stooges!" concluded the priest.

SLOVAKIA'S ACCESSION TO THE TRIPARTITE PACT**Francis Vnuk**

On September 27, 1940, at the New Chancellery in Berlin, the German-Italian-Japanese Tripartite Pact was signed. "The ceremony of signing" — noted Shirer — "was carried through with typical Axis talent for the theatrical."(1) The German and satellite press greeted the occasion as an event of far-reaching importance, a "Magna Charta" of the New Order, which was going to bring about exactly what had been promised in the preamble to the Pact, namely, "world peace" . . . and "prosperity and welfare of the peoples" in Europe and Greater East Asia.(2)

After the ceremonial signing, Hitler entered the hall to honor the occasion by his presence. Then followed the adulatory speeches of Ribbentrop, Ciano, and Kurusu. In the course of his speech Ribbentrop stated: "The purpose of the Pact is, above all things, to help restore peace to the world as quickly as possible. Therefore, any other state, which wishes to adhere to this bloc with the intention of contributing to the restoration of peaceful conditions, will be sincerely and gratefully made welcome and will participate in the economic and political reorganization"(3)

In response to this rather blunt hint, the nations of Central Europe, tied to Germany by geopolitical conditions, duly applied for admittance. Hungary was the first in the field, the others following her more or less reluctantly. It was clear to the Slovaks and Rumanians that they could not afford to stand aside, even if they wished. They had to rank at least as high in Hitler's esteem as Hungary which still had unfulfilled territorial claims against them. And thus towards the end of November, 1940, Hungarian, Rumanian, and Slovak delegations in close succession went to Vienna or Berlin(4) to sign the Protocol of adherence to the Tripartite Pact. Hungary did so on the 20th, Rumania on the 22nd, and Slovakia on the 24th of November, 1940(5).

Slovakia's accession to the Tripartite Pact followed the proclamation of the "spiritual adherence" a few weeks

previously. Though Ciano sneered at the event as "a useless bit of ersatz diplomacy"(6), the Germans made it into a spectacular State visit which was arranged for Tuka and his entourage. State visits had a strange fascination for Tuka. Nothing appealed to him more than to be a centre of attention, surrounded by high officials, and facing the flashlights of official photographers and reporters. He did not conceal his disappointment when the Germans advised him against his proposed visit to Rumania, or when the Italians asked him to postpone his offered visit of Italy till "after the war." The signing of the Protocol of Accession enabled him to taste the cherished moments of ceremonial courtesies and at the same time to demonstrate his devotion to Germany. Apart from these rather personal considerations, there were also quite a few important political, economic, and cultural problems to be discussed, new policies outlined, and achievements and failures reported.

SIGNATURES

The German preparations for Tuka's State visit were very detailed and thorough. Tuka was to be received with all the honors and courtesies due to the head of a friendly government. In the captured documents of the former German Foreign Ministry, there is a special file (7) dealing exclusively with various aspects of the visit and this is the principal source of all relevant information.

The Slovak delegation(8), which consisted of Tuka, Murgaš, Mračna, Radlinský and Farkaš, left Bratislava by auto on the afternoon of November 23, 1940. They crossed the bridge to Petržalka and proceeded to Vienna where a special train was awaiting them. The reception there was very austere. There were no guards of honor to inspect, no speeches of welcome; just one representative of the Protocol to accompany them on their night journey to Berlin. The train left West Bahnhof at 7:32 P. M. and took them through Linz, Passau, Regensburg, Hof, and Leipzig to the Anhalter Bahnhof, Berlin, where they arrived on Sunday morning at 10:40 A. M. — just 20 minutes after the Rumanian delegation, its mission accomplished, left Berlin on its return journey (9).

At the Anhalter Bahnhof everything was pompous, well-organized, and impressive. Welcoming personalities were grouped in four parties. The first party, headed by the Slovak charge d'affaires, consisted of foreign diplomats and the heads of missions in Berlin. Specially invited German representatives of the Party and the Army were in the second, the members of the Slovak Legation in the third, and the personnel of the German Foreign Ministry in the fourth group.

Tuka, as he alighted from his salon-car, was welcomed by Ribbentrop and Matthew Černák, and introduced by them to the other members of the welcoming parties on the platform. Then followed the inspection of the Guard of Honor. Tuka, in the uniform of the Hlinka Guards and accompanied by Ribbentrop, was trying his unsoldierly best to make his gait and mien look soldier-like.

From the station the procession of cars went to Schloss Bellevue which was going to be Tuka's residence during his two-day stay in Berlin. There he was welcomed by Meissner who acted as master of the house (Hausherr).

At 11:30 Tuka paid a visit to Ribbentrop at the latter's office, 73 Wilhelmstrasse, where they spent about an hour in discussion.

The great moment came at 1:00 P. M. In the Grand Reception Hall of the New Chancellery stood a huge massive signature table. The representatives of the Press had already taken their places: the foreign correspondents at the window-side, the Germans at the door. At 12:58 P. M., the great door opened and an impressive procession entered. It was led by the Chief of the Diplomatic Protocol. He was followed by Tuka and Ribbentrop, the Japanese Ambassador, the Italian Ambassador and Charge d'Affaires, the Hungarian and Rumanian Ministers, State Secretary Weizsaecker, and State Under-Secretary Gaus. Ribbentrop sat at the center of the table, Tuka at his right and, next to him, the Italian Ambassador and the Rumanian Minister. At Ribbentrop's left were seated the Japanese Ambassador and the Hungarian Minister.

Everything went without a hitch like a well-rehearsed drama. The Protocol of Accession (10) was signed amidst

the flashes of light and rustle of reporter's notebooks, short speeches were solemnly read out and courteous applause resounded in the spacious hall.

In the afternoon Ribbentrop gave a reception at the Hotel Adlon for the Slovak Delegation and the members of the Slovak Legation in Berlin.

In the morning of the next day (Monday, November 25) Tuka took part in the wreath-laying ceremony at the Ehrenmahl (The War Memorial at the famous Unter den Linden). Another reception was given by Černák in the afternoon at the Hotel Esplanade. At 5:30 P. M. Tuka had his great and memorable moment. He was taken to the Work Room of the New Chancellery where he was received by Hitler. That was the climax of Tuka's State visit.

Shortly before 7 P. M., the Slovak Delegation was again on the Anhalter Bahnhof. With the German and foreign guests to bid them farewell, guards of honor to inspect, hands to shake or raise in Nazi salute, the parting ceremony was as imposing as the welcoming one. At 7:05 P. M., the special train with the Slovak Delegation left Berlin on its return journey to Vienna, where they arrived on November 26, at 10:54 A. M.

The Slovak Parliament gave its approval to the Protocol of Accession to the Tripartite Pact on February 6, 1941(11).

DISCUSSIONS

The records of discussions between Ribbentrop and Tuka were not found. But it is possible to gauge their nature and content from numerous memoranda passed between Ribbentrop and his advisers shortly before Tuka's visit. Some of these memoranda are very sketchy, others go into great details. They deal with subjects which Tuka outlined to Consul-General Wuester (on November 11, 1940) as the topics he would like to discuss personally with Ribbentrop on the occasion of his State visit. And even if the discussions did not follow the proposed course exactly, they could not have departed far from it. These memoranda are thus of interest to every student of Slovak affairs. They certainly cast some light on the Slovak scene as it was set in November, 1940, and provide a

guileless cross-section of the Slovak political, economic, and cultural life.

The problems were grouped under four headings and each division had further subsections. The same pattern will be followed in this study.

The subject matter for discussion was to proceed along the following lines:

A. Political Problems.

1. Internal Policy:

Internally Slovakia was in the middle of a political crisis and Woermann and Killinger briefed Ribbentrop about its extent. They informed him that Tuka and Mach were working on the establishment of the Nazi system in Slovakia ("nazionalsozialistische Staatsfuehrung"), in the spirit of the Salzburg conversations. In this attempt they had to wage a struggle against the opposing forces centered around President Tiso. Tiso's camp consisted of — in Killinger's terminology — clericals, former Ďurčanský hangers-on and four members of the government. Tuka demanded dismissal of these ministers, but Tiso refused to comply with his request. Tuka then decided to fight it out with Tiso, and, according to Killinger, there were forces at work striving for a complete elimination of Tiso from the Slovak political life (eine völlige Auschaltung Tisos aus dem politischen Leben").

In discussing this question with Tuka, Ribbentrop was advised to recommend that Tuka should apply his measures in such a way as not to affect the position of President Tiso. There was no objection to the eventual removal of the uncooperative ministers, but as far as Tiso was concerned, his removal would only deteriorate and not improve the internal situation in Slovakia. "Tiso" — runs Woermann's recommendation to Ribbentrop — "as Hlinka's successor and the co-founder of the Slovak State, is a very popular personality in Slovakia" ("eine durchhaus volkstuemliche Personlichkeit"), and, therefore, the elimination of the clerical influence should be carried out carefully and possibly by evolutionary means. The conversion of Slovakia into a Christian state according to Schusch-

nigg's model ("Staendestatt"), as contemplated by Tiso and his friends, could be prevented even without the removal of Tiso. On the other hand Tuka should be commended for his fight for the Nazi reorientation of Slovakia.

2. Territorial demands:

The second problem Tuka wanted to discuss was the territorial cession of the eastern part of the Protektorat to Slovakia (the region of Moravské Slovacko). In this respect several memoranda were passed to the German Foreign Ministry outlying the reason and justification of this demand. But the Germans were not happy about the proposition. Ribbentrop was advised to tell Tuka that the idea of the frontier rectification in favor of Slovakia could not be considered ("keine Folge gegeben werden koenne").

3. Slovak-Hungarian Relations:

The Slovak-Hungarian relations were by far the most important point of the discussions. The Vienna Award — by which Slovakia was forced to cede part of her territories to Hungary — was a source of constant Slovak grievances and was genuinely detested by all Slovaks, whether they were pro-Nazi, anti-Nazi, or just sitting on the fence. Tuka was convinced that the Salzburg conversations meant a step towards a more acceptable solution. At Salzburg (July 1940) Tiso wrenched from Ribbentrop a somewhat vague and non-committal promise that the question of the frontier rectification between Slovakia and Hungary — though unsuitable for settlement at that time — could be considered later ("dass in Augenblick nicht an die Regelung dieser Frage zu denken sei, dass vielleicht spaeter einmal der Augenblick kommen duerfe"). On the basis of this promise the Slovak Foreign Ministry forwarded to Berlin a number of Aide-Memoires, maps and statistical material and wanted them to be examined by the Auslandsinstitut in Stuttgart. Tuka was to ask Ribbentrop for the official German attitude towards these Slovak requests.

It was proposed to tell Tuka that the moment for the settlement of the disputed boundary issue was still inap-

propriate ("Es waere unzeitmaessig diese slowakische Ansprueche jetzt geltent zu machen"). With regard to the examination of the Slovak documentary material by the Auslandsinstitut in Stuttgart — since the Germans did not want the Hungarians to get wind that something was going on — it was suggested that this request should be declined. Tuka should be told that the German Foreign Ministry would examine the pertinent Slovak material, but it did not think it expedient to pass such things on to the Auslandsinstitut.

4. Ruthene Question:

Then there was the question of the Ruthene minority. This group, about 50,000 strong, was subjected to intense communistic propaganda inciting it to demand the same privileges as those granted to the German ethnic group. The solution of this question required a precarious balance in counteracting the communist propaganda without arousing the suspicions of being hostile towards the USSR which at that time was being courted by the Germans into joining the Tripartite Pact.

Tuka was to be told that the Slovak Government would have to try to win the sympathies of the Ruthenes even if it involved the offer of a guarantee of cultural autonomy. But the communist intrigues would have to be suppressed just the same ("Kommunistische Umtriebe unter ihnen waeren zu unterdruecken").

5. Attitude towards the Croats:

It was expected that Tuka, who had just learned about the German attitude towards the Croats, would make an offer to influence the Croats through Slovak propaganda.

It was suggested that his declaration should be merely noted and any discussion of his proposal should be declined.

B. Economic Problems:

The economic topics for the discussions are of equal importance. In spite, or, perhaps because of the war, the Slovak economy was developing very favorably. The Ger-

mans were taking 75 per cent of Slovak exports and, contrary to the general belief, were providing valuable expert and material assistance. Nevertheless, there were points of friction even in this sphere, especially with regard to the direction in which the development should proceed. The Germans pressed for projects like the improved facilities of the Bratislava Danube harbor, raising of the level of agricultural economy, erection of family houses for workers, etc., whereas the Slovaks were for industrial development, new factories, improved local communications, etc. At the time of Tuka's visit the Slovak grievances concerned the price increases, tourist trade, and employment of Czech skilled workers.

1. Price Question:

The Slovak government was afraid that the price increases might create unwanted social reactions which, in turn, could be exploited by the communists. But the Germans maintained that, since rising prices were a general phenomenon in all Southeast Europe, and also in the Protektorat whose economy was closely bound with Slovakia's, it was desirable for them to go up in Slovakia as well.

It was proposed to point out to Tuka that the price increases would, in the long run, increase Slovakia's national income through expansion in exports to Germany and through the wage transfer of the 80,000 Slovak labourers working there. The Germans would try to mitigate the effect of price increases by such measures, for example, as lowering the prices of goods imported from the Protektorat. Likewise — in spite of the recent increases in the price of coal — the export prices of German coal delivered to Slovakia were not increased, but were retained at the level fixed in April, 1940, and would stay there.

2. Tourist Trade:

In the matter of the Slovak complaint concerning the rapid decrease in the tourist trade, it was to be stated that there was not much the Germans could do about it. It was, however, to be expected that after the war Slovakia would enjoy an unprecedented tourist activity.

3. Employment of Czech Workers:

For Tuka this represented another thorny problem. There were still many Czechs working in industrial establishments in Slovakia, mainly as skilled workers. Tuka pressed for their removal, since he saw in them a constant element of unrest ("Unruheherde"). The Germans promised to cooperate, saying that some Czechs had already been transferred.

Ribbentrop, however, would have to advise Tuka that those Czechs working in the armament industry could be removed only when satisfactory replacements by skilled Slovak workers had been found.

C. Resettlement Problems:

1. Czechs in Slovakia:

Tuka strove to rid Slovakia of all Czechs (approximately 25,000 in number), as well as to bring back to Slovakia all Slovaks living in the Protektorat. Since the negotiations ("Auseinandersetzungverhandlungen") with the Germans were ominously dragging on, Tuka wanted to ask Ribbentrop about the German view on the matter.

Ribbentrop was advised to instruct Tuka that the proposal would be examined in due time, but, on the other hand, not to give any prospect for fulfillment of this wish ("Keine Aussicht auf Erfuellung des Wuensches za machen").

2. Slovaks in the German POW Camps:

After the military collapse of France, several unfortunate Slovaks found themselves as POWs in German captivity. In most cases they were Slovak workers from Paris and from the Northern French coalfields who were mobilized into "Czecho-Slovak" army units to fight for the restoration of the defunct Czecho-Slovak Republic. The Slovak Foreign Ministry had been demanding their release since the end of the Franco-German hostilities, but the German authorities were not very quick in answering.

Tuka was to be assured that their release was pending.

3. Slovaks in France:

With equal commendable zeal the Slovak Government

tried to obtain the release of all Slovaks in the French Army Service, in both occupied and unoccupied France, and pleaded for the repatriation of those who desired it.

Tuka was to be told that the Germans looked upon the request with understanding and would give it their support.

D. Cultural and Other Problems:

In the cultural field there was complete satisfaction on both sides. The Slovak-German cultural relations were very friendly and preparations for the signing of a Cultural Agreement ("Kultur-Abkommen") were on the way.

Similarly there were no complaints about the treatment of the German ethnic group in Slovakia.

IV CONCLUSION

Looking at the event after almost 20 years' interval, when one has the benefit of seeing what was back of the German mind, and when one knows all the answers to what were then the annoying questions of the day, it is only too easy to be critical, cynical, or even malicious.

Was Tuka really the villain of the drama? Was he really responsible for all subsequent Slovak misfortunes? Was his signature on the Protocol the death-warrant of the Slovak State as some of his critics want us to believe?

Or, was he just an innocent victim of circumstances from which there was no way out? Did he merely carry out the inevitable and inescapable steps to save the nation from a much worse disaster, as his admirers try to convince us?

Unfortunately there is no straightforward answer to either of these views. Tuka's personality was of a far more complex nature than to be an object of a clear-cut judgment. It would be futile and out of place to argue about this. However, to make the picture as complete as possible, it seems only just to add the following notes by way of a postscript.

It is undeniable now, as it was conclusive then, that the Tripartite Pact was directed against the USA(12), where, as it happened, lived almost a third of the Slovak

nation. And there is no doubt about Tuka's willingness to have Slovakia bound to Germany lock, stock, and barrel. But the personal ambition of a sick man was not the only why and wherefore behind Tuka's move. There were also political motives and these were by no means insignificant: to gain for Slovakia an honorable place in the New Europe — which at that time was not just a remote phantasy; to ward off the Hungarian danger — as menacing and ubiquitous as ever. It is not always realized that the fear of being swallowed by Hungary had a hand not only at the birth of the Slovak State, but was present in the background of practically every action of subsequent Slovak foreign policy.

The political and military situation — at the time of Slovakia's accession to the Pact — strongly favored the German position. Germany was the undisputed master of Europe, and with the USSR she had a Treaty of Non-Aggression. The USA was keeping out of the war and was likely to stay out. For Hitler and his gang "the war was already won." This thought, however, was not shared by all. There were many who did concede (though they have less courage to admit it now) that the war might finish in a draw. Such a situation would have curbed Hitler's ambitions for world domination, but it would leave the nations of Central Europe at his mercy. And it is better to be left at the mercy of a benign than an irate master.

Then the question arises as to what would have happened if Tuka "per impossibile" would have chosen to resist German prompting and decided not to join the bloc. The problem may be highly academic, but the answer to it is less so. In fact, an eloquent reply was provided about three months after Slovakia's accession to the Pact by the adherence of Bulgaria. To the Western way of thinking, Bulgaria was the best of the bad satellites of Hitler. She saved most of her Jewish population from extermination, she did not declare war on the USSR (though the USSR found it expedient to declare war on her). In the face of German pressure she yielded the bare minimum — and this included the accession to the Pact. It is hardly to be expected that Slovak opposition could have been more ef-

fective. With no friends and no guarantees in the West, Slovakia could not behave the way Yugoslavia did.

REFERENCES

1. W. Shirer: **A Berlin Diary**, Hamilton, London, 1941.
2. For the text of the Tripartite Pact see **Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression**, Vol. V, pp. 355-6, or **Int. Affairs**, 1939-46, Vol. III, OUP, 1954, pp. 81-82.
3. C. A. Macartney: **October Fifteenth**, Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1956, Vol. I, p. 439.
4. The Hungarians went to Vienna, the Rumanians and Slovaks to Berlin.
5. Other countries followed suit: Spain secretly in November 1940; Bulgaria on March 1, 1941; Yugoslavia on March 25, 1941; Croatia on June 15, 1941. The USSR nearly joined the Pact, too (See **Nazi-Soviet Relations**, pp. 248-9, 258-9).
6. **Ciano's Diary** 1939-43, Heinemann, London, 1947. Entry of November 20, 1940: "...I do not attach much importance to the adherence of these states (Hungary, Rumania and Slovakia) which are vassals of Germany, or almost so. In fact they weaken the Tripartite Agreement itself, and seem to be useless bits of ersatz diplomacy."
7. Auswartiges Amt, Buero St. Sekretaer, Besuch Tuka, 610/248742-818.
8. For the Delegation's "Who's Who" see Appendix III.
9. "He (Antonescu) had barely left Berlin...when Dr. Tuka, the Slovak Prime Minister, arrived to sign his country's adhesion to the Pact. The document was ready and his signature was prompt" — Dipl. correspondent of the London "Times". In fact, the signing took place less than two and a half hours after Tukas' arrival.
10. For the text of the Protocol see Appendix I.
11. Joseph Lettrich: **History of Modern Slovakia**, Atlantic Press, London, 1956, p. 167.
12. Article 3 of the Pact runs: (The three Contracting Parties) "further undertake to assist one another with all political, economic and military means, if one of them is attacked by a Power at present not involved in the European war or in the Chinese-Japanese conflict." This could have meant only the USA or the USSR. But Article 5 stated that the terms of the Pact did not "in any way affect the political status which exists between each of the three Contracting Parties and Soviet Russia."

APPENDIX I

The Protocol of Slovakia's Accession to the Tripartite Pact

The Governments of Germany, Italy and Japan, on the one hand, and the Government of Slovakia, on the other hand, represented by the signatories to the document, declare as follows:

1. Slovakia joins the Tripartite Pact signed at Berlin on September 27, 1940.
2. As far as the joint technical commissions provided under Article 4 of the Tripartite Pact concern matters affecting Slovak

interests, Slovakia will be represented at the discussions of these committees.

3. The text of the Tripartite Pact is attached to the present Protocol, which is drawn up in the German, Italian, Japanese, and Slovak languages, each text to have the validity of the original.

The Protocol comes into effect on the day of signature.

APPENDIX II

The Slovak Delegation — Who Was Who:

Dr. Vojtech Tuka — Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs. Born on July 4, 1880, at Piargy, Tuka was, before 1918, a Professor of International Law at the then Hungarian University at Bratislava. After the first World War he played a leading role in the Slovak autonomist movement of the Hlinka Party. Accused of treason by the Czech Prague, he was involved in the notorious "Tuka Trial." On flimsy and rigged evidence he was found guilty of espionage and plotting against the Republic and sentenced to 15 years in jail. After having been imprisoned at Pankrác in Prague for more than seven years, sick and nearly blind, he was pardoned by Presidential amnesty, and the remainder of his sentence he was to spend in custody at Plzeň. Released in October, 1938, he promptly resumed his political activity. In the first Slovak independent government (March 1939) he became the deputy Prime Minister and later, after the retirement of Sidor, also the acting Minister of Interior. On the election of Dr. Joseph Tiso as President of Slovakia, Tuka became Prime Minister. After the Salzburg Conference (July 1940) Tuka not only retained his post, but also took over the Foreign Ministry. Tuka was executed by the Prague Government in Bratislava August 20, 1946.

Matúš Černák — Slovak Minister in Berlin. A high school teacher by profession, Černák had a long record of continuous activity in the ranks of the Hlinka Party. In September, 1938, he was appointed a minister in the Czechoslovak Government. He immediately demanded autonomy for Slovakia. This not granted, he resigned in protest. In the first Slovak autonomous government he was given the post of the Ministry of Education (October 1938) and in addition was entrusted with the leadership of the Youth Organization (Hlinka's Youth). Being openly for a complete secession, he was imprisoned by the Czechs (March 1939) and treated rather brutally. After the Declaration of Slovak Independence he was sent to Germany as the Slovak diplomatic representative. He was killed by a bomb sent through the mail in Munich, July 5, 1955.

Karol Murgaš — Chief of the Propaganda Bureau. A journalist, Murgaš came into prominence in the hectic days of October 1938 — March 1939. After the Salzburg Conference he was made the Chief of the Propaganda Bureau as the only suitable choice (he was the only person of intelligence and ability ready to tow the German line).

Ing. Jozef Mračna — Chief of the Political Division of the Slovak Foreign Ministry. Mračna was born on February 21, 1900. He was a career diplomat of the Czechoslovak diplomatic service. At the time of the declaration of Slovak independence (March 1939) he was the Czechoslovak Consul in New York, but immediately offered his services to the Slovak State. Gifted, honest and experienced, he was

the most capable and authoritative personality in the Slovak Foreign Ministry, but later he became rather passive. He enjoyed Tuka's full confidence and in return was his loyal, but not uncritical, co-worker.

Dr. Radúz Radlinský — Chief of the Diplomatic Protocol at the Slovak Foreign Ministry. Former employee of the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry, where he held a minor position in the Protocol. On the basis of this activity he was entrusted with the position of Chief of the Diplomatic Protocol in Bratislava. The Germans constantly objected to his position.

Lieutenant-Colonel Štefan Tatarko — Military Attaché at the Slovak Legation in Berlin. A professional soldier of some ability, Tatarko created practically out of nothing the Slovak Military Secret Service. Later he was appointed military attaché to Berlin. At one time he was not trusted by the Germans because of his incautiously expressed doubts about final German victory. But he must have corrected himself, because later he was promoted to the Chief of Cabinet at the Slovak Ministry of defense.

Ján Belnay — Commercial Attaché at the Slovak Legation in Berlin. He was born on October 23, 1900. Most of his study-years (in Chemistry) were spent in Germany, the remainder in Prague. He worked at the Czechoslovak Economic Academy, and later at the Czechoslovak Export Institute. In March, 1939, he joined the staff of the Slovak Foreign Ministry and soon was appointed a commercial attaché to Berlin. His professional experience and fluent knowledge of German served him in good stead and in 1941 he was promoted to the position of Chief of the Diplomatic Protocol.

Ján Farkaš — Tuka's Adjutant. As a companion in Tuka's tribulations (he figured in the "Tuka Trial") Farkaš claimed also a share in Tuka's honors. He devoutly followed Tuka's footsteps and parroted his pronouncements about the introduction of Nazism into Slovakia, but was not particularly gifted to make a higher grade. At one stage Tuka insisted on his appointment as a Minister of Finance, but was rebuffed.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"Since, in the new situation, it was impossible to collaborate officially with the Soviet Union, we . . . did nothing which might prejudice or prevent the removal of co-operation at the earliest possible moment; I need only recall how strongly our attitude contrasted with that of many others during the Soviet-Finnish War. Moreover, even in that period, there was no interruption of the personal contacts and exchange of information between ourselves and important Soviet representatives in London, Paris, Washington and elsewhere." — **Dr. Hubert Ripka**, EAST AND WEST, London, 1944.

SLOVAKIA AND THE CHURCH

The question of the position of Slovakia in the Roman Catholic Church was again erroneously explained recently. And once again by Czechs who apparently still feel that they should dominate the Slovaks in all things. In a recent issue (No. 2, 1959) of the Czech Catholic periodical "*Nový Život*" (New Life) — published in Rome — the question whether Archbishop Beran was a Czech or Czechoslovak Primate was answered in this fashion:

"The Prague Archbishop was therefore a Czech Metropolitan, but Primate of the Czech (Bohemian — ed.) kingdom. And this title is used on official documents to this day.... When, therefore, the boundaries of the state were increased or decreased, the territory of the Primate also automatically increased or decreased.

"But as long as the Czechoslovak Republic is the legal heir of the Czech (Bohemian — ed.) kingdom, the Archbishop of Prague is the Primate of the entire state and can be called the Primate of Czechoslovakia (or, if you will, the Czechoslovak Primate), even though the Prague archbishops, after the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic, never did call themselves in this fashion, but used only the old historic title; and the title tells us nothing else but that the Primate is (often because of the antiquity of the bishop's See) the first bishop in the state. The basis for this denotation is therefore territorial and not perhaps linguistic and the less so even political."

"The truth will prevail," say the Czechs, and the Slovaks firmly believe that it will even in this case, the feelings and propaganda of the Czechs notwithstanding!

According to valid ecclesiastical law the status of dioceses or ecclesiastical provinces is decided exclusively and only by the Holy See, the highest ecclesiastical authority (Can. 251, par. 1). Consequently, only the Holy See grants or changes titles of persons who have jurisdiction or whatever authority, even if it be only honorary over these units. This is valid in every case and, hence, even in the case of Slovakia.

When Saint Methodius was given jurisdiction over the Danubian Slovans (Slavic peoples), the Slovaks certainly belonged to that area, because the document of Pope Adrian II is even addressed to Svätopluk, who at that time

ruled in Nitra, and to Kocel', Pribina's son, who managed Pannonia (Cf. Cod. dipl. et epist. regni Boh., t. 1, No. 12, pp. 7—9).

Nitra had become a bishopric already in 880 A.D. (*Registrum Johannis VII*, epist. 257, Arch. Vatic.) on the basis of the decision of Pope John VIII. Prague only in 973, that is, ninety-three years later. The forefathers of the Slovaks, settled on both sides of the Morava river, formed the nucleus of the Great Moravian Empire. The fact that Nitra is the oldest bishopric of the Slovans north of the Danube is not altered at all by the unfavorable conditions that prevailed at that time (Wiching) or later which enabled the ignoring of its significance. At that time, therefore, Slovakia had its bishopric and belonged under the jurisdiction of Saint Methodius.

After the fall of the Great Moravian Empire early in the tenth century, Slovakia eventually became a part of Hungary even as regards ecclesiastical affairs. The bishopric of Nitra was re-established about 1024 and always recalled the days of SS. Cyril and Methodius. The rest of the territory of Slovakia belonged under the ecclesiastical management of Ostrihom and Eger, even though, for example, the Spiš province had its own provost from the end of the twelfth century.

A great stride forward was the establishment of new bishoprics on the territory: the bishopric of Banská Bystrica, Spiš Province, and Rozňava in 1776; the diocese of Košice in 1804; and the Greek Catholic diocese of Prešov in 1816. Nitra, Banská Bystrica, and Rozňava belonged under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Ostrihom, while the Spiš and Košice bishoprics were under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Eger as suffragan bishoprics.

After the establishment of Czecho-Slovakia in 1918, the apostolic administratorship of Trnava was established temporarily. The new position of Slovakia within the Church was determined in 1937, when the Holy See issued the Apostolic Constitution "Ad ecclesiastici regiminis incrementum" (AAS, 1937, pp. 366-369). This Constitution freed the Slovak dioceses and apostolic administratorships from the jurisdiction of Ostrihom and Eger and placed

them directly under the jurisdiction of the Holy See. True it is, that even this position is considered temporary by the document, because it expressly states that the Apostolic See will establish a Metropolitan See as quickly as possible in Slovakia. Slovakia would then become an independent ecclesiastical province. The document, furthermore, expressly commands all concerned to abide by the decision of the Holy See and forbids any opposition to it or violation of it.

Unfortunately, the world situation did not permit the establishment of an ecclesiastical province in Slovakia. Legally, then, according to Church Law, the dioceses and apostolic administratorships of Slovakia are directly under the jurisdiction of the Holy See, that is, they are responsible to the Holy See directly and not to the Prague or Olomouc provinces.

Since that is the case, we know then that the explanation given by the Czech periodical *Nový Život* is erroneous.

According to present Church Law, the title of Primate is purely an honorary one. Excepting the Hungarian Primate, the bearers of this title have no jurisdiction because of it. In the past, however, Primates did have a definite right over Metropolitans and Bishops (Wernz-Vidal: *Jus Canonicum*, II, Nr. 517). Of course, only the Holy See has the right to grant or change this title — just as it has to grant or change any other title denoting such a high honor. Since we are concerned with a title that is more of a historical nature, its bearers use it in the same sense that it was granted, even though it is not in line with the present terminology of countries or their political division or affiliation (federation). So it is that in France the Archbishop of Lyons uses the title of "primas de Gaulles," and not the title of French Primate; the Archbishop of Salzburg uses the title "Primate of Germany" and not Primate of Austria and Germany. Similarly, then, even the Prague archbishops consistently used and still do use the title "Primate of the Bohemian Kingdom" or "Primate of the lands of the former Bohemian Kingdom." In the Czech case, there is no basis for changing this title arbitrarily by private individuals.

The author of the explanation given in the Czech periodically *Nový Život* assumed that Slovakia was a part of the Bohemian Kingdom. History, however, tells us that Slovakia was not a part of that kingdom, and, therefore, had no jurisdictional connection with it. And when a new political state was formed, composed of the lands that once belonged to the Bohemian Kingdom and of Slovakia, the distinction was made, if we recall, between the so-called "historical lands" and Slovakia (as if Slovakia did not have a history of its own!) and, therefore, there was a difference between the heir to the historical lands of the Bohemian Crown and Slovakia, the land of the Slovaks. In short, what applied to the Bohemian Kingdom did not apply to Slovakia which was not a part of that kingdom.

But even if anyone should think that Slovakia is also heir of the Czech State, let him bear in mind that the title of Primate is territorial. It is valid only in the territory that it was granted and not otherwise, unless the Holy See changes it with a new decision. This was adhered to even by the Archbishops of Prague.

One might believe that, as a rule, there is only one Primate in any one state, but he would be mistaken. In Spain the title of Primate is enjoyed by two archbishops: the Archbishop of Toledo and the Archbishop of Tarragon. England and Scotland form one political state, but the English Primate is not the Primate of Scotland. When Ireland belonged to one political formation with England, the Primate of England was not the Primate of Ireland. There is, therefore, no objective argument in this regard to extend arbitrarily the title of Czech Primate over a new territory, to Slovakia.

If we allow our thoughts to be the offspring of our desires, then there is no guarantee that they will be correct. It is only when our thoughts express an objective reality that they are truthful. Then even the deeds following from them can be just.

Some time ago the *Nový Život* published an address of the Archbishop of London in which His Excellency — on the basis of the erroneous information — referred to the Archbishop of Prague as the Primate of Czecho-Slo-

vakia. The editor of the Czech periodical had the opportunity to learn how the Slovaks in Rome felt about the matter. They held no ill will for the Archbishop of London, but they did for the Czechs associated with **Nový Život**, the editor of which certainly knows better. The Czechs apparently have learned little or nothing from the past. They keep parroting listlessly the slogan "truth will prevail" — a lá Masaryk and Beneš — while they spread false propaganda even about those who are supposed to be "closely related" to them. It is obvious that the Czech periodical "**Nový Život**" (New Life) is still following the old life which brought ruin to the Slovak and Czech nations.

• • •

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL JUSTICE

Rev. William A. Kaschmitter, M.N.

Due to the scientific and technological revolutions of the past century, the world has become international in spite of itself and does not know what to do about this new situation. The number of international organizations created since 1860 to cope with specific international problems is simply phenomenal. The first global attempt made to grapple with all of these problems in general was made after World War I when the League of Nations was formally erected. The League failed but its failure did not kill the sense of need for such an organization and after World War II another attempt was made in the creation of the United Nations Organization. Unfortunately, many people today fear that the United Nations Organization will go the way of the League unless it can "grow up" and mature to the point where it can command not only the respect but also the confidence of all nations, great and small.

Justice — Not Merely Charity

There are good-hearted people who think that charity alone will suffice to cure the ills of our world. It is true that love for God and neighbor are the two greatest commandments and that according to St. Paul, Charity is the

fulfillment of the law. We must remember, however, that obligations of justice take precedence over the obligations of charity and that where justice is lacking there can be no true charity. To give to our neighbor in charity what is due to him in justice would be sordid mockery.

Those of us who have seen Communists at close range know how violently they oppose charity as a substitute for justice but unfortunately they seem to know little about what justice really is and what it demands. It is equally unfortunate that many of our anti-Communist statesmen seem to know just as little as the Communists do about what justice demands in the international sphere.

The Charter of the United Nations in its Preamble speaks of justice for all nations, and President Eisenhower in a recent television address declared that justice and peace are only two faces of the same coin. These declarations would not only be admirable but supremely important if they were accompanied by a clear-cut and sound definition of what justice between nations is and what it demands. Even without a precise definition of justice and its demands, such declarations would be truly precious if we could assume that the present world order is just; for then every one of us could easily supply a definition merely by saying that justice demands the preservation of the **status quo**, the observance of international treaties, international agreements, etc. Here, the crucial question is:

Is Our Present World Order Just?

Many good people seem to think that the only thing that's wrong with our world is that we have too many Communists and that if we could only be rid of Communism the whole world could be happy. They think that the ogre of Communism is kept alive only by the lying propaganda of a few self-seeking tyrants who keep their dupes in line with the most savage terrorism. I hold no brief for Communism. I could not defend Communism without betraying my own friends who suffered exquisite torture at Communist hands and without betraying all of the Christians in China, some of whom were buried alive by the Communists while I was still in Peking.

Without excusing the horrors and abuses of the Communists, let us admit here and now that it is precisely the injustice of our present unbalanced and unhealthy world order that provides the Communist propaganda machine with its best ammunition. I hope within the next few minutes to cite some facts and statistics to prove that our present world is unjust but before taking up that point I'd like to call your attention to a few of the glaring failures and mistakes of the Free World in its fight against Communism.

The Free World is placing great emphasis on military preparedness as a means of combatting the Communist threat. That, of course, is necessary. It's a mistake, however, to think that bombs and bullets can ever be an antidote to an ideology — especially the kind of ideology which Pope Pius XI has described as a kind of mysticism — a false mysticism, it is true, but still a mysticism. There are Communists who would be willing to fight with stones and sticks if necessary and are willing to die rather than give up that pseudo-mysticism of theirs.

Most people in the Free World admit that bombs and bullets are no real antidote to the Communist ideology and they are therefore stressing the idea of freedom as an anti-dote to Communistic ideals and practices.

Freedom is, of course, one of God's greatest natural gifts to man. History has also proven over and over again that an atmosphere of freedom is most conducive not only to sound political life but also to healthy economic development. This freedom, however, must be real; it must be for all; above all, it must be in harmony with justice.

When I was directing the Catholic news service in Peking I got reports of a million people starving to death in China. These people were "free" to eat — if they could find the necessary food. They couldn't find it — and hence they were not really free to eat.

The liberalistic ideas of John Locke, John Hobbes and Jean Jacques Rousseau as applied in the nineteenth century led to economic anarchy and all kinds of injustice. That kind of liberty gave birth to the monstrosity that we know as Communism today and it is still provid-

ing ammunition for the Communist propaganda machine in the hungry countries today. Liberty of that kind is as closely related to Communism as a grandfather is related to his grandson.

Liberty if joined together with justice can indeed serve as a splendid antidote to the Communist ideology and there are many good men who are making it so today. On the other hand, there are others who are loud in condemning Communism, but who are afraid even to whisper that the hungry people in other countries have a real right to human existence. That kind of anti-communism is ineffectual if not actually harmful.

Let us then have liberty — but let it be a liberty that is eternally wedded to JUSTICE FOR ALL MEN! It is only on this kind of justice, coupled with liberty, that we will be able to provide an effective antidote to the Communist ideology.

The biggest job ahead of us is to create a system of social thought that will provide for real justice for all men. If that justice is wedded to the truth that makes men free, this combination of justice and truth and freedom will give birth to an ideology that will be more effective than all of the "A" and "H" bombs in the world. If, on the other hand, we continue to tolerate a world order in which more than half of humanity is deprived of its right to a truly human existence, our bombs may prove to be nothing but the instruments of a wholesale destruction in which democracy itself will perish and we ourselves will go down to ultimate defeat.

Our Unjust World Order

Providing enough food for everybody is certainly one of the most basic requirements for a healthy world order. There are many prophets of doom who fear that the day will soon come when the earth simply cannot provide food for all.

It is certainly true that half of the world's population today is undernourished if not actually starving. Some say that no less than 70 percent of the human race is undernourished.

The question for us to consider is this: is all this hunger really due to over-population or is it due to mismanagement in our conduct of world affairs?

Experts of our Department of Agriculture in Washington are quoted as saying that 16,000,000,000 acres could be used by modern methods throughout the world for food production. On the other hand, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations declared in its 1956 Yearbook that at present less than 3,340,000,000 acres are under cultivation. If these figures are accurate, it means that 79 percent of the land that could be used for food production, is now simply going to waste.

These statistics certainly indicate that there is still a great deal of land that we could use and are not using. Other facts seem to indicate that we are not using our God-given brains either. Alluding to the great progress made by the agricultural scientists in recent years, the **Daily News** in New York declared editorially on August 7, 1952 that if we really put our scientific know-how and technical skill to work in this country, the Mississippi Basin alone could provide food for a population of 500,000,000 or approximately three times the present total population of this whole country. **Reader's Digest** in its issue for September, 1952, carried an article in which it was stated that Brazil alone could support a total population of one billion or nearly twenty times its present population. These estimates are based on the present findings of agricultural science and we must remember that the scientists are constantly finding ways of increasing production. As one of them declared: "The big harvest is still ahead." Another scientist, Professor Rosin, who is not interested in agriculture but in chemistry, has declared that if we devoted only as much money to chemical research as we spend in one month on military preparedness, the chemists could find ways of producing so much food artificially that we could turn all our farms into parks and flower-beds and still feed humanity more adequately than it is being fed today.

A sad but effective commentary on the statistics quoted above is provided by the "plague" of agricultural over-

production which is giving farmers and statesmen such a headache in various countries. During his campaign speech on agriculture last fall, President Eisenhower told us that our Government has spent \$9,000,000,000 for the purchase of agricultural surplus products merely to keep them off the market and is storing them at the cost of \$1,000,000 a day.

In 1957 our Government had paid farmers 260 million dollars for not cultivating 12,000,000 acres and, according to the President's campaign speech, the planning called for the immobilization of from forty to fifty million acres in 1958. Agricultural producers of about 25 countries who met in Nairobi, Africa, a few years ago, complained that the most serious problem confronting world agriculture today is the fact that "effective demand" cannot keep up with productive capacity.

Time does not permit of any detailed discussion of natural resources of our earth in so far as these things industry, trade and finance or of the still undeveloped have a bearing on hunger and the world's other ills. Suffice it to say that industry in some areas is forced to curtail production and lay off workers simply because people in other areas, some of which are enormously rich in undeveloped resources, are too poor to buy what they really need or what they would like to have.

The facts and figures which I have just quoted seem to prove conclusively that if half of the human race is still hungry, the blame is not to be placed on poor old mother earth. Neither are our agricultural scientists to blame. The blame is rather to be placed on the immaturity of our international politics and our international economics. Our science is indeed worthy of the twentieth century but our international economics and our international politics seem to be stuck somewhere in the nineteenth, the eighteenth, the seventeenth or the sixteenth century.

The tragic significance of the agricultural statistics which I have just quoted is punctuated and accentuated when they are compared with conditions in the hungry nations. Japan, with a population of more than 90,000,000

today has less farm land than is actually under cultivation in the little State of New York. With more than six million farm families, the country has only 14,000,000 acres of food producing land. Let us remember that according to the experts quoted by Josue de Castro, there are still nearly 13,000,000,000 acres throughout the world that could be used for food production but are actually lying idle. If these figures are even approximately correct, it means that throughout the world there are more than 900 arable acres lying idle for every acre that Japan has at her disposal for food production.

In the cities of Japan, a better than average wage is sufficient only to keep a man, his wife and one child in comfort. With two children the situation is no longer comfortable and with three children, a man with even a better than average wage is apt to go into debt. Three million people in Japan are suffering from tuberculosis and 1,300,000 are more or less mentally deranged, largely due to economic worries.

Under such circumstances, is it surprising that this Abortion has been legalized for economic reasons so that non-Christian nation is going all-out for birth-control? a family that is too poor to support another child can legally have an abortion. In 1955 abortions in Japan equalled the number of births — 1,700,000 of each.

The Japanese know the horrors connected with abortions and for that reason 30,000 experts have been trained in the use of contraceptives so as to teach people everywhere how to use them. Shall we blame the Japanese for these practices or shall we place the blame on the insane world order that makes such things necessary?

It would take too long to give the corresponding data concerning India, Java, Egypt, China and many other crowded sectors of the globe. I have already told you that when I was in Peking I received reports of 1,000,000 deaths by starvation in China at a time when my own brothers in Idaho were being paid for not cultivating their fields. Need I remind you that China is today the second greatest stronghold of Communism in the world?

Where Is The Solution?

Many of you may remember that certain spokesmen for the World Health Organization of the United Nations hoped to solve the world's problems by starting all-out birth control movements in the crowded areas of the globe. Some of the Catholic representatives in the World Health Organization opposed this plan so bitterly that the others dared not go on openly with their plan for fear that the whole Organization would be destroyed.

Though the Catholic representatives in the World Health Organization opposed birth control they did not succeed in bringing forward any real solution. During a violent controversy I had in Tokyo eight years ago on the subject of birth control, I too was challenged to bring forward a positive solution. The challenge seemed reasonable so a number of us began to study not only the effects of the world's population and its resources but also contemporary social theory. After several years we arrived at the conclusion that contemporary social theory — at least our Catholic social teaching — is mature enough to INDICATE solutions for social and economic problems WITHIN a nation but that even our Catholic social doctrine has not matured to the point where it can effectively grapple with INTERNATIONAL social and economic problems.

It was obvious to all of us that we could not find the talent in Japan that would be needed to extend our social teaching to the international sphere so I gave up my press work on the first of January last year in order to go looking for the needed talent. During this year and a half I have contacted a large number of Catholic specialists in economics, sociology, international law, moral theology, natural law, etc. In Asia and Europe as well as in the United States I found general agreement among the scholars I consulted to the effect that our failure to extend our social teaching to the international sphere has:

- a) greatly weakened our position in the face of international Communism;
 - b) defeated many of our efforts for world peace.
- These specialists also agree that it is imperative to mobil-

ize the best talent of the whole world for the creation of a new science of international social justice.

A Science Of International Social Justice

It is of the essence of a science that it should include all of the related principles underlying a specified field of knowledge along with the conclusions logically drawn from those principles. The history of all of our sciences shows that no science has ever grown up over night but in many cases the principles were shown and accepted long before they were coordinated into a system and before most of the conclusions had been drawn.

In the matter of international social justice, we have a few basic principles which can now be affirmed though the scholars have not as yet drawn up any system of conclusions from them.

Perhaps the most basic of these principles is that every human being has a real right to a human existence. That does not mean that every one is entitled to a Cadillac or a Ford. Perhaps not to a bicycle. But every human being does have a right to enough to eat, enough to wear, enough to feed, clothe and house his children. People also have a right to found a family and therefore also the right to enough of this world's goods so that they can observe the natural law in family life.

The correlative of a "right" is not charity or handouts, but justice.

It cannot be said that this or that individual has an obligation in justice to provide this or that stranger with all that is needed for a human existence. It can, however, be said that society has an obligation in justice to set up such a social and economic order as will enable all men, under the proper conditions, to secure for themselves what is needed for a truly human existence. It can also be said that all of the members of society have an obligation in justice to do their share in order that society as a whole can create such a social and economic order.

A second principle that can be affirmed is the one enunciated by Pope Pius XII on June 1, 1941, when he pointed to all of the land now going to waste throughout

the world and declared that it had been "created and prepared" by God "for the use of all.." His Holiness did not, of course say: "for the OWNERSHIP of all."

It is to be expected that any attempt to reduce this principle to practice will meet with bitter opposition on the part of that liberalistic school of thought which seeks absolute freedom of action in the economic sphere and refuses to face the responsibilities which are correlative to every right.

Perhaps the best answer for people who take this stand is the well known fact that a mistake in a chemical laboratory can blow up not only the laboratory but all of the workers who are in it. History shows many cases in which mistakes in politics or economics have also led to explosions that are far more disastrous than can occur in any laboratory. Communism might be referred to as one such explosion — and it has already engulfed nations with a total population of some 800,000,000.

You may remember that Pope Pius XII on December 24, 1941, only two and a half weeks after Pearl Harbor, called for a "new order, based on moral principles" which would enable "nations less favored by nature" to have access to resources beyond their borders, resources which, His Holiness declared, were "destined for all." In the same paragraph, His Holiness warned that if nothing were done in the future peace treaty to create such an order, there would remain in the relations between peoples a deep and far reaching root of dissension which would eventually "lead to new conflicts."

It was, perhaps, fear of such new conflicts which prompted the authors of the Atlantic Charter to make a similar plea or pledge earlier that year. Unfortunately, little has been done so far as to implement the pleas and pledges of the Holy Father or the Atlantic Charter.

That the Pope's warning about "future conflicts" was well-grounded is proven by the many danger spots that exist in our world today. There is no need to cite more than one example — that of Japan:

Hoping to solve their national problems in a peaceful way, a group of Japanese business men suggested a few

years ago that Japan buy the whole island of New Guinea and thought \$8,000,000,000 would be a fair price. The island has a population of less than 2,000,000 but an American population expert estimated in 1929 that it could support about 125,000,000 Orientals.

If the proposition had reached the discussion stage, all of the nations involved could have insisted on conditions that would guarantee their own security but refusal on the part of Australia and England was so instantaneous and blunt, that it never did reach the discussion stage. According to Anton Zischka in his book **Japan in der Welt**, Portugal was willing to sell her part of Timor to Japan several decades ago but was forbidden to do so by England to which Portugal owed a great deal of money.

If Japan had been able to buy New Guinea, her people would have new hope for the future and would be kept so busy with development work that radicals and war-mongers would get little or no hearing and Japan would today be a strong, steady influence for the whole Far East. As it is, most of the foreigners I met in Tokyo feel that if nothing is done soon and in a big way to remedy Japan's economic condition, no moderate Government will be able to remain in power in Tokyo 15 or 20 years from now. These people fear that if nothing is done to give the Japanese people real hope, the country will be forced by economic necessity to go either to the extreme right of more militarism or to the extreme left of Communism. The probability is in favor of Communism and this view is confirmed by a report concerning the Japanese Federation of Student Autonomous Organizations published in the New York Times on July 18, 1957. According to the **Times** article,, the Federation has 270,000 members out of a total of 680,000 College and University students and its official magazine recently published an article which spoke of the "heavy responsibilities" the members would have in carrying out their "special mission" when the Democratic revolution comes.

A leading Australian Catholic who visited me in Tokyo several years ago summed up the situation as follows: If Japan goes Communist, the United States will have to withdraw from Okinawa and that will mean that Australia,

Indonesia, the Philippines, Burma, Siam and what is left of Korea and Indochina will all be surrendered to Communism. Developments of this sort would certainly bring World War III much closer. If such a war does break out, many will cry out again in a frenzy against "War Criminals." It is logical to ask, however, whether the real "War Criminal" will not be that unhealthy and insane world order which leaves half of humanity hungry in a world of potential plenty.

Appeal to the Universities

I have referred to two principles which could serve as foundations for a new science of international social justice. One of these principles is that every human being has a real right to a human existence. The other is that the land now going to waste was created and prepared by God for the use of all.

I have also referred to the pleas of Pope Pius XII and the Atlantic Charter for a world order which would give hungry nations access to resources beyond their borders.

To build up such a science and blueprint this new world order will require the best talent the world has to offer. While this science would provide guidance for statesmen, we must recognize that the statesmen are too busy to undertake this kind of an assignment which requires the quiet study that is possible only for university men and private research workers. The new science will have to be based on natural law but if it is to be of practical value it will have to be integrated with all of the social sciences. For this reason, the cooperation of economists, sociologists and specialists in international law, etc., will be needed as well as that of moralists and specialists in natural law.

Objections

It might be objected that even the most perfect science of international social justice will be of no use unless we get international laws passed to back up the findings of such a science. This is a real objection but an answer to it is to be found in the relationship between the ideas of law and justice. While laws are enacted to guarantee a regime of justice, it is absolutely impossible even to draft a

good law until our notions of justice are clear. Within nations where people have been rubbing shoulders for century after century, our notions of what is fair for everybody are fairly clear and it is for this reason that the nations have been able to draft many good laws. In the international sphere, however, practically no progress has been made in the notion of justice and its demands since the days of Francisco de Vitoria 400 years ago and Hugo Grotius 300 years ago. This is one of the main reasons why our international law is still so inadequate and there is no hope of developing a really effective system of international law or of ending our era of virtual international anarchy until our notions of justice between nations are clarified.

Another objection which some might raise is that any attempt to introduce real international social justice would simply rob the rich without helping the poor. To this the answer is obvious. The fact that most farmers and workers in the United States today have enough money to buy automobiles has not hurt our automobile industry in the least. If an era of international social justice could raise the living standards of another billion and a half of human beings, their added buying power would open up such markets and inaugurate such a period of general prosperity as the world has never dared to envision even in its fondest dreams.

Last Argument in Favor

As a final argument in favor of international social justice we might say that there is no real hope of world peace as long as large segments of the human race have every reason to feel that they are not being treated justly. This feeling is the stuff of which wars are made and promoted with the plea of "self defense." World War II cost us 20,000,000 dead and 30,000,000 wounded. Financial costs, including war damages and war costs amounted to \$1,340,000,000,000 or about \$520 for every man, woman and child in the whole world — a total of \$2,600 for every family of five persons. Not included in these items are the tears and heartaches of hundreds of millions of human beings who lost a father, a brother or a son during the war. If we are pushed into an atomic World War III, the cost of World

War II will look like peanuts. It has been well said that the next war will be fought with atomic power and the one after that with bows and arrows.

I remember that when I started to study history some 47 years ago, I congratulated myself on having been born in an age that is civilized and no longer wages war. I was just old enough to register for service when World War I ended, but, during World War II, I had ample time in Japanese Concentration Camps to think over the kind of civilization we have today and the result has been a very, very sad disillusionment.

Millions of others, soldiers with their wives, their parents and their children have been similarly disillusioned and if one of our Catholic organizations can spearhead a movement in favor of such justice as will prevent wars in the future it will have millions of followers.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"The United States passed a law against Communists. This law is giving the gentlemen from the Central Action Committee of the (Czechoslovak) National Front — who now shamelessly appear under the name the Council of Free Czechoslovakia — quite a headache. The new law is made to order for all Socialists, but also for many Czech Populists and Slovak Democrats who helped to destroy the economical structure of Czech-Slovakia, to suppress political freedom and who otherwise cleared the road for the complete victory of Communism. Of course, it is altogether possible that the gentlemen will try to dodge the consequences of their past by denying and lying about it. But it is not only the National Socialists who are appearing under a false flag. (Lettrich's) Slovak Democrats are doing the same thing: without notifying their members or asking them for their assent, they have now changed to "Slovak Agrarians." Of course, income from the Agrarian International is connected with this and the gentlemen, who never before were agriculturists by vocation, have nevertheless become professional Slovak Agrarians." — (NÁROD, Czech Bulletin, London, Nov. 1950).

SLOVAK NATIONALISM:**B. S. BUC, Ph.D.****NATIONALISM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY****1. The Ephemeral Slovak Soviet Republic**

Because of the deeply religious basis of the Slovaks as well as the agrarian nature of Slovakia, Communism with its revolutionary materialistic-social program had from the beginning no hope of winning over the Slovaks. It, therefore, endeavored all the more to conquer them by force. The first attempt at forceful domination in Slovakia was undertaken in 1919. This occurred after the First World War in connection with the creation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic whose leader was the well known Bela Kuhn. The Hungarian Communist government invaded Slovakia with its army and occupied the Eastern sector with the cities of Prešov and Košice. Following in the wake of the occupation, a public Communist assembly met at Prešov on June 16, 1919, and announced the establishment of the Slovak Soviet Republic with the proclamation that:

This day the Slovak Soviet Republic was created on Slovak soil, liberated from imperialism. The first conscious, instinctive act of the proletariat, freed from the yoke of Czech imperialism, was that oppressors proclaim with such great glory, but in reality falsify (1).

At this assembly, a temporary revolutionary committee was appointed which transferred its seat from Prešov to Košice. There on June 20, 1919, a twenty-member Slovak Revolutionary Council was named with the Czech Communist A. Jaroušek at its head. This Council formally informed the Czecho-Slovak government in Prague that Slovakia is separating from the Czech lands. Immediately the Soviet government of Moscow hastened to greet this new Slovak dictatorship of the proletariat.

The existence of this very stormily-begun Slovak Soviet Republic was short-lived. On July 5, 1919, the Red Hungarian Army was coerced to withdraw from Slovak territory and the "Slovak Soviet Republic" ended. Except for many atrocities perpetrated on the inhabitants by the

Red Army, no signs whatever remained in Slovakia after this three-week Communist adventure (2).

2. Coordination of Nationalism and Class Struggle

After the shattering of this first Communist attempt to enslave Slovakia in 1919, it would hardly be necessary to speak of the Communist Party in connection with Slovak nationalism. But the situation which ensued in Slovakia, after Communist occupation in 1944 through Russian partisans and then the army, made the Communist Party one of the most significant fashioners of the present fate of Slovaks in general. It was a repetition of the events of 1919, except with longer lasting and far-reaching results. Communism would never have attained its present position in Slovakia, had the end of the war not permitted it. Election results prior to the Second World War indicate that the Communist Party was never powerful in Slovakia; in the election year of 1919, it had 10.66 per cent of the votes; in 1935, 12.97 per cent. And even these percentages would be lower, if other nationalities were separated and only Slovak votes counted. This is shown by the fact that in voting districts comprising a clearly Slovak population, the percentage gains of the Communist Party were always substantially lower than in districts where they were mixed with Hungarians(3).

The weak successes of the Communists in Slovakia, despite the facts that the social situation of the Slovak population was really not the best, must be attributed to the religious foundation of the Slovaks and in part to the influence of the Hlinka Slovak People's Party, which in its program presented a more compact statement of the national and social demands of the Slovak inhabitants.

Recalling to mind the delicacy of the nationality problem in the newly established Czecho-Slovakia, the Communist Party immediately in 1919 began to orientate its program in order to draw as much as possible from it. Clement Gottwald, leader of the Party, marked this program in 1924 in the following words:

Such a solution to the question must be sought and found which will enable the Party to support nationality movements

and to unite its revolutionay energies, or to coordinate with revolutionay class warfare the whole proletariat of the Czechoslovak Republic. I am of the opinion that the Party can, with comparative ease, gain leadership in the movement of national minorities and thus cast to the rear the bourgeois-chauvinist parties.... The Communist Party in Slovakia must not only utilize the national movements for the class interests of the proletariat, but must stand directly at its head and lead it along paths actually revolutionay (4).

In accord with the plan, the Communist Party in Slovakia also fought for the autonomy of Slovakia as did the Slovak People's Party. When in the elections of 1925 the autonomists achieved their greatest successes, the Communists hastened to promise more than autonomy. In January, 1926, they announced:

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia raises..these concrete demands: the complete independence of Slovakia. Let the Slovak nation itself decide on arranging its own affairs (5).

This signified competition with the autonomists in emphasizing Slovak national ambitions. We do not know for sure whether to account the gains — even though trivial — of the Communist Party in Slovakia to its social struggle for the rights of the proletariat, or to its tactizing with Slovak nationalism. But the latter definitely gained votes for them.

Despite its more than positive position in regard to Slovak nationalism, the Communist party was nevertheless organized only on a statewide basis as a "Czechoslovak" Party. Its leadership in Slovakia, however, rested in the hands of a small but capable group of Slovak intellectuals, who became adherents of the Party not from social motives, but rather because its ideological foundation introduced to them a new kind of belief. They were Slovak nationalists, but because of their negative attitude toward religion, they found it difficult to attach themselves to the other two national parties, namely, the Slovak People's Party and the Slovak National Party; the former was led by a Catholic priest, the latter by a Lutheran minister. They were, therefore, idealists blinded by idealism to such an extent that they were unable to realize that the Communist Party was actually an instrument of Russian imperialism, concealing itself at times in relation to

Slav nations under Russian Pan-Slavism. They were fittingly called "Salon Communists," because both their social position and their behavior were in complete opposition to the concept "proletariat" which they were supposed to represent.

It is not surprising, therefore, that this group of Slovak Communists received the dissolution of Czecho-Slovakia in 1938 with as much joy as the other Slovak national elements. Although the Slovak Government had forbidden the activities of the Communist Party, yet a majority of its representatives was left free and held important offices. This enabled them, through salon and not revolutionary means, to make preparations for the opportune establishment of a "Slovak Republic without Germans and Fascists" when the occasion should arise (6).

3. Towards a New Slovak Soviet Republic

The moments for the fulfillment of their plans seemed to arrive when, near the end of August, 1944, Soviet parachutists succeeded in carrying the operations of war into Slovak territory and called forth co-called "Slovak uprising against the Germans." Slovak Communists, therefore, hastened in September of that year to establish the independent Communist Party of Slovakia to the great surprise of Czech Communist agents. They acted in accord with Moscow itself, which sought, through its partisans, to win over the President of the Slovak Republic, Joseph Tiso, by promising protection to the Slovak Republic (7).

Tiso's attitude to these efforts was one of greatest rejection:

Cooperation with Moscow would have signified a terrible catastrophe for the nation. It would have been a denial of Christianity. Communism was from its first beginnings and remained an irreconcilable enemy not only of our nation, our independence, but is a danger for all of Europe. Communism brings with itself a rapid debasement of the moral, spiritual and material level of every nation in whose bosom it reposes. Every true patriot, therefore, cannot soil his hands by cooperating with such a political system as well as with its representatives residing in Moscow (8).

In these steps we see the two-faced action of Moscow, which "did not cease to assure officially that her aim was

to renew the Czech-Slovak Republic, but underneath carried on, through her partisans, a survey to ascertain the mood in Slovakia towards the annexation of that country (9).

4. Change of Moscow's Plans

When Moscow failed to gain support of Slovak national elements to proclaim the Slovak Soviet Republic and saw that Communism in Slovakia lacked strong roots, she decided definitely to reestablish Czech-Slovakia. The elections of 1946 in renovated Czech-Slovakia indicate why this solution was more advantageous for Moscow's plans. The Communist Party in Czech territory had a more probable chance of winning.

This decision of Moscow, however, meant the beginning of tragedy for Slovak national Communists. It was already discernible in the action of Moscow, which appointed William Široký, a Hungarian by origin, as Chairman of the newly established Communist Party in Slovakia in preference to Slovak nationalists. In Široký Moscow found a very compliant instrument for her further political drama in Czech-Slovakia.

Czecho-Slovakia indeed was renewed, but not in its original size and greatness. First of all Moscow annexed Ruthenia. When Dr. Edward Beneš was returning from Moscow, shortly after the Red Army occupied Slovak territory, he had to remain in Košice where the native Communists compelled him to agree to the so-called Košice program of April, 1945, according to which the new Czecho-Slovakia was to be a state of two nations, Czech and Slovak. Clement Gottwald, as Premier of the government, announced on April 5, 1945, that "the Republic will be renewed as a common state of the co-equal Czech and Slovak nations" and that "the new government of the Republic will be concerned that, during the constitutional solution of the relations between the Czech and Slovak nations, the Slovak organs will be constituted with the same legislative, administrative and executive power which the Slovak nation enjoys today in its Slovak National Council" (10). Perhaps, in respect to elections, the Slovaks

were at least promised autonomy as the last step to win them over to Communism.

5. Centralized Czecho-Slovakia Once Again

A year later, in May of 1946, the first elections were held in the new Czecho-Slovakia, and they indicated a substantial difference within the Communist Parties of Slovakia and the Czech lands. The Communist Party of Slovakia, united with the Social Democrats, gained 30.6 per cent of the votes; whereas in Czech territory the Communist party obtained 40.4 per cent and the Social Democrats 15.6 per cent which together totalled 56 per cent. In Czech lands we see a very evident victory for the Communist Party. Of the 300 seats in Parliament, the combined parties of the Communists and Socialists had 153 deputies. A certain official from the Russian embassy made this observation about the results of the 1946 elections: "**The majority is not great, but it suffices in order to rule over the other parties in a democratic way**" (11).

The elections sounded the death knell of the promised autonomy for Slovakia. Theoretically, the principle of two nations was continually stressed; practically, however, even a stronger centralization than during the first Czecho-Slovak Republic began to shape up. Even more, on September 28, 1948, when the Communist Party of Slovakia was abolished and became a part of the united Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia. This was more than the Slovak Communists could stand. Even the fear of retaliation could not restrain them from rising up in opposition. The threat of revenge for this deviation from servility was not long in coming. In February of 1951, the foremost leaders, V. Clementis, Dr. G. Husák, L. Novomeský and K. Šmidke, were expelled from the Party and deprived of all functions because "they planned a new Slovak separatist program and together formed a plot aimed at tearing Slovakia away from the Czecho-Slovak Republic" (12).

In April others were condemned as bourgeois nationalists. The substance of their crimes is contained in a long condemnation, in which we find the following:

The ideological background of their treachery consisted in their attempts to solve the national question of the Slovak nation, not in collaboration with the Czech working class but mainly in cooperation with the Slovak bourgeoisie and accepted eventually their leadership. In this connection they accepted the Slovak fascist puppet State. Later on, they successfully penetrated the leadership of the Slovak national uprising and got hold of important positions in the new People's Democratic State. They misused their positions in the Slovak National Council and on the Board of Commissioners in a criminal way in order to isolate Slovakia from the Czech working people and from the construction of Socialism, thus strengthening in Slovakia the remnants of capitalism and jeopardizing the achievements of the Slovak working class. Their aim was to break up the common Czechoslovak State and to hand over Slovakia to the reactionary bourgeoisie and to the mercy of foreign imperialists (13).

We do not know how L. Novomeský, one of the accused, understood, after his trial, the words which he wrote in 1948, prior to his imprisonment, in the introduction to a book of his co-sufferer G. Husák:

They say superficially that revolutions devour their own children. This is not true! The truth rather is that revolutions, determined to remain faithful to their program, slough off those of their children who would pervert their meaning, their program and their end (14).

After this purge President Gottwald appointed a Czech Communist, M. Bacílek, as President of the Slovak National Council. The whole apparatus of the Communist Party and administration in Slovakia is now in the hands of Czechs and Magyars, and not in the hands of Slovak elements.

In liquidating the Communist Slovaks, Prague liquidated practically the idea of a Czechoslovak State. Between the years 1945 and 1947, Beneš had annihilated the Catholics, the principal political force of Slovakia. During the course of the crisis in 1948, the Czech Communists and Democrats had erased such Slovak Protestants as Lettrich, and Ursíny. Prague suppressed finally the last political support of the Czechoslovak State in Slovakia: the Communists. The fourth Czechoslovak Republic as a national State of Czechs and Slovaks is, therefore, dead. Instead a Socialist Soviet State emerges (15).

6. Aftermath of Stalin's Death

The changes in Moscow after the death of Joseph Stalin, however, testify that the drama of Slovak na-

tionalist Communists is not completed and awaits the completion of its last act, if the new seemingly revolutionary directives, inaugurated by the XX Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow by Khrushchev, will be brought into effect. These directives, among other things, stress very emphatically the principle of self-determination in dealing with the national ambitions of various nations. If action really follows words, then this "new Moscow approach" towards the solution of problems stemming from nationalism may give the Slovak nationalist Communists new hopes to implement their old dream, the Slovak Soviet Republic. It seems that the first step along this new line was made by the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Czecho-Slovakia, which convened from the first to eleventh of May, 1956, in order to discuss the directives of the XX Congress of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. Present at this meeting was W. Široký, the present Prime Minister of the Czecho-Slovak Government. He uttered a manifesto in which among other things, he stressed:

Above all it is necessary to concern ourselves with the questions of extending the jurisdiction of the Slovak National Council of the highest organ of State power in Slovakia. Today there are already suppositions for extending the legislative jurisdiction of the Slovak National Council, and we must probably think also about constitutional changes in the same way.... In just that way must we consider extending the jurisdiction of the Slovak National Council in the eyes of the Board of Commissioners and expressly establish constitutional conclusions of responsibility to the Board of Commissioners of the Slovak National Council (16).

The Slovak National Council and the Board of Commissioners, according to the Košice program of 1945, were to be the legislative and executive organs of the planned autonomous government of Slovakia. After the elections of 1946 their jurisdiction was completely limited, so that they really became only executive organs of the centralist administration of Prague. The conclusion of W. Široký's address would be that in due time a complete autonomy would prevail. But W. Široký went so far as to say: "as the foundation of its politics concerning the nationalist question, the Communist Party considers the right of na-

tions toward self-expression, that is, the right to break away freely from or unite freely to another nation" (17).

Such a position would have been favorably acceptable to the nationalist Slovak Communists, but Široký, a Stalinist and still in power, gave to it his own interpretation. It was certainly with the intention to threaten his imprisoned colleagues that in concluding his address he said:

Noting our successes, . . . we can in no way underestimate the influence of the bourgeois nationalist ideology. Its heralds utilize every occasion of unrest, every want and negative manifestation for its spread and livelihood. It is the platform of the enemies of socialism, and must not even lead us astray then when bourgeois nationalism, as for example at present, emerges under the slogan of a People's Democratic Slovakia (18).

Here then is the evidence why nationalist Slovak Communists, even when released from prison, have not been rehabilitated. If, however, Moscow shall desire the removal of W. Široký and Bacílek and shall set up the first, then the world in the near future shall be surprised to hear the proclamation of a new Slovak Soviet Republic. The recently developed situation in Hungary strengthened again the position of the Stalinists and brought about the occupation of Slovakia by the Czech and Russian armies.

7. There Will Be No Stopping

The existence of the Slovaks as a political force in Central Europe is not a fact of negligible importance at the present time. They have reached such a level of group consciousness that it will be impossible to disregard them in dealing with the political problems of that area. Their emergence presents a vivid example of the development of modern nationalism, for, as Don Luigi Sturzo has written: "Once a country or a people has succeeded in developing a consciousness of its own personality and on affirming it in the struggle with which history has confronted it, there is no stopping."

Many incentives led the Slovaks to develop a consciousness of their own personality despite the fact that they have been living for over a thousand years without any specific political rights within Hungary.

The first incentive came from the social philosophy of the Enlightenment. It created a new political power out of the submerged social class of people by advocating certain rights for the masses in dealing with the public affairs of states. At the same time this movement destroyed the predominance of Latin and elevated the people's language to literary prominence. In the case of the Slovaks it led to the codification of their vernacular language which became the first step towards the assertion of their own distinct personality.

German Romantic philosophy provided a second incentive and gave a further impetus towards the same goal. Its contribution consisted in defining more closely the concept "people" by changing it into the concept "nation" whereby a greater stress was placed upon the importance of a common history, language and culture. This philosophy was also instrumental in creating among the Slav nations a literary and political movement called Pan-Slavism. Under the impact of Pan-Slavism Slovaks were made aware of their glorious past as represented by Greater Moravia, the first Slav state in Central Europe, and began to feel that their land was the cradle of present-day cultures.

The third incentive was provided by President Wilson's principle of self-determination of nations and the Western Allies' decision to dismember Austria-Hungary after the First World War. The map of Central Europe was changed and the Slovaks became a part of a new state called the Czechoslovak Republic. In the Czechoslovak Republic they were supposed to be equal partners with the kin Czechs, but these ambitions were never realized because the imaginary "Czechoslovak" nation sought to merge them with the Czechs on the ground of their close kinship. Nevertheless, in the Czechoslovak Republic the almost extinct Slovak community grew up into a new democratic society, and the Slovaks were ready to venture into an independent life in their own Slovak Republic. At present the overwhelming majority of Slovaks consider the situation as an enforced one and remain almost united in their efforts to regain their lost independence.

Under the present circumstances their objectives and efforts are directed towards the following goals:

1. Slovakia within the framework of a democratic Czecho-Slovakia is still the objective of a small group of "Czecho-Slovaks" who are composed primarily of former diplomats and leading personalities of the first Czechoslovakia. Being aware of the opposition of the majority of Slovaks at home against the Czechs this group of Slovaks finally agreed to have the state based on the idea of two distinct Czech and Slovak nations instead of the former imaginary "Czechoslovak" nation.

2. Independent Slovakia either as a unit within the proposed federated Central Europe or simply as an independent democratic state. Both alternatives enjoy almost the same popularity with the overwhelming majority of the Slovaks at home and abroad. They represent the desires and endeavors of a substantial part of the Slovak population whose objective has always been to assure for Slovaks the rights of an ethnographically, culturally and politically distinct personality in the international family of nations.

3. A Slovak Soviet Republic might have been the objective of a small group of Slovak Communists before they were executed or imprisoned as bourgeois deviationists. They once again seemed to have had a chance to act after Stalin's death but are now forestalled by what happened in Hungary in 1956.

In spite of the fact that there still are groups among the Slovaks that endeavor to make Slovakia dependent upon the Czechs or upon the Russians, the ambitions of Slovak nationalism will hardly be gratified until the Slovaks find their haven in a sovereign Slovak State or in such a political arrangement of Central Europe wherein the Slovaks will be allotted the same sovereign rights as other so-called established nations possess today.

(1) M. Gosiorovský: "**O Sovietoch na Slovensku v roku 1919**", **Nová Mysl**, Prague, September, 1919, 276-284.

(2) **Ibidem**.

(3) For example, in the elections of 1929 voting districts comprising a clearly Slovak population conceded very little percentage-wise to the Communist Party: Prešov 4.57 per cent, Turčian-

sky Sv. Martin 6.18 per cent, Banská Bystrica 7.60 per cent. Whereas in districts comprising a greater majority of Hungarians, the Communists showed greater gains: Košice 15.48 per cent and Nové Zámky 16.84 per cent. — Dr. F. Ďurčanský, *Biela Kniha*, Buenos Aires, 1954, p. 784).

- (4) **Pravda Chudoby**, 30. júna 1954.
- (5) **Pravda**, 30. mája 1926.
- (6) Ďurčanský, *op. cit.*, p. 796.
- (7) Dr. F. Ďurčanský, "Márne sa snaží Moskva získať Slovákov", *Literárny almanach Slováka v Amerike*, Chicago, 1953, pp. 43-48.
- (8) *Ibid.*, pp. 45-46.
- (9) J. Smutný, *Dôklady a rozpravy*, (London, November 1952), p. 5.
- (10) *Ustanovení československé vlády Národní fronty Čechu a Slováku a její první projevy*, (Praha 1947), pp. 21 sp.
- (11) H. Ripka, *Czechoslovakia Enslaved*, (London, 1949), p. 47.
- (12) **Rudé právo**, (27. februára 1951).
- (13) Joseph Mikuš: *La Slovaquie dans le drame de l'Europe*, Paris, 1955.
- (14) G. Husák, *Zápas o zajtrajšok*, (Bratislava, 1943), p. 3.
- (15) J. A. Mikuš, *op. cit.*, p. 386.
- (Paris, 1955), p. 386.
- (16) **Slovák**, (jún 1956).
- (17) *Ibidem*.
- (18) *Ibidem*.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Association Hongroise des Affaires Etrangères. *La déportation des Hongrois de Slovaquie*, Budapest, 1947.
- Aulneau, J.: *Histoire de l'Europe Central*, Paris, 1926.
- Autonomist: *Slovakia's Plea for Autonomy*, Jednota Press, Middle-town, Pa., 1935.
- Beneš, E.: *Czechoslovak Policy for Victory and Peace*, London, 1944.
- Beneš, E.: *Le probleme Autrichien et la question tchèque*, Paris, 1908.
- Beneš, E.: *My War Memoirs*, London, 1928.
- Blaško, S.: *Slovakia in Blood and Shackles*, Passaic, N. J., 1954.
- Bokes, F.: *Dejiny Slovákov a Slovenska* (History of the Slovaks and Slovakia), Bratislava, 1946.
- Botto, J.: *Slováci: Vývin ich národného povedomia* (Slovaks: the Development of Their National Consciousness), Turčiansky Sv. Martin, 1906.
- Carr, E. H.: *Nationalism and After*, London, 1946.
- Chmelar, J.: *National Minorities in Central Europe*, Prague, 1937.
- Clementis, V.: *Panslavism, Past and Present*, London, 1943.
- Čulen, K.: *Dejiny Slovákov v Amerike* (History of the Slovaks in America), Bratislava, 1942.
- Čulen, K.: *Česi a Slováci v štátnych službách ČSR* (Czechs and Slovaks in the Civil Service of the Czechoslovak Republic), Bratislava, 1944.
- Čulen, K.: *Pittsburghská dohoda (The Pittsburgh Pact)*, Bratislava, 1937.
- Denis, E.: *La question d'Autriche: Les Slovaques*, Paris, 1917.
- Diamond, W.: *Czechoslovakia Between East and West*, London, 1947.

- Ďurčanský, F.: **Slovenská biela kniha (Slovak White Book)**, Buenos Aires, 1954.
- European Movement: **Basis For An Eastern European Policy**, London, 1950.
- Gottwald, K.: **Slovensko hladuje (Slovakia is Starving)**, Bratislava, 1925.
- Gottwald, K.: **Za socialistický štát, za socialistické právo (For a Socialist State, For a Socialistic Right)**, Prague, 1940.
- Hodža, M.: **Federation in Central Europe**, London, 1942.
- Hrušovský, F.: **Slovensko v dejinách Strednej Európy (Slovakia in the History of Central Europe)**, Turčiansky Sv. Martin, 1939.
- Hrušovský, F.: **This Is Slovakia**, Obrana Press, Scranton, Pa., 1955.
- Ingrim, R.: **After Hitler Stalin?** Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1946.
- Lloyd George, David: **The Truth About the Peace Treaties**, London, 1925.
- Macartney, C. A.: **Hungary and Her Successors**, London-New York, 1943.
- Macartney, C. A.: **National States and National Minorities**, London, 1934.
- Macartney, C. A.: **Problems of the Danube Basin**, London, 1942.
- Masaryk, T. G.: **New Europe**, London, 1917.
- Masaryk, T. G.: **The Problem of Small Nations in the European Crisis**, London, 1915.
- Masaryk, T. G.: **La résurrection d'un état (Souvenirs et réflexions 1914-1958)**, Paris, 1930.
- Mendelsohn, P.: **The Nuremberg Documents**, London, 1946.
- Mikuš, J. A.: **La Slovaquie dans le drame de l'Europe**, Paris, 1955.
- Ministerstvo vnitra (The Ministry of Interior): **Spiknutí proti republike (Conspiracy Against the Czechoslovak Republic in Slovakia)**, Prague, 1947.
- Osuský, S.: **Beneš and Slovakia**, London, 1943.
- Peroutka, V.: **Budování štátu (Building of a New State)**, Prague, 1933-1936.
- Popovici, Aurel: **Die Vereinigten Staaten von Grossostereich**, Leipzig, 1906.
- René, Reny: **Questions d'Autriche-Hongrie et questions d'Orient**, Paris, 1903.
- Ripka, H.: **Small and Great Nations**, London, 1944.
- Ripka, H.: **Czechoslovakia Enslaved**, London, 1948.
- Schlesinger, R.: **Federalism in Central Europe**, London, 1945.
- Seton Watson, R. W.: **Slovakia Then and Now**, London and Prague, 1931.
- Seton Watson, R. W.: **A History of the Czechs and Slovaks**, London, 1943.
- Seton Watson, R. W.: **Eastern Europe Between the Wars 1918-1941**, London, 1945.
- Sidor, K.: **Andrej Hlinka**, Bratislava, 1934.
- Sidor, K.: **Slovenská politika na pôde pražského snemu (Slovak Politics On the Floor of the Prague Parliament)**, Bratislava, 1943.
- Shafer, Boyd C.: **Nationalism: Myth and Reality**, New York, 1954.
- Slovak Catholic Federation of America: **The Slovaks and the Pittsburgh Pact**, Chicago, 1934.

Sturzo, Dr. Luigi: **Nationalism and Internationalism**, New York, 1946.
 Thomson, Harrison: **Czechoslovakia in European History**, Princeton Press, New Jersey, 1944.

Ustanovení československé vlády Národní fronty Čechu a Slováku a její první projevy (Decrees and First Manifestoes of the Czech-Slovak Government Composed of the Czech and Slovak National Front), Prague, 1947.

Ústav Dr. E. Beneša (Dr. E. Beneš Institute): **Doklady a rozpravy (Documents and Deliberations)**, London, 1952.

ARTICLES IN MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

Brauner, H.: **Die Volkswerdung der Slowaken (The Development of Slovaks Into a Nation)**, a treatise published in Deutsches Archive für Landes und Volkswerdung, Vol. V, Berlin, 1944.

Darras, M.: **Onze ans de vie indépendante en Slovaquie, Le monde slave**, Paris, May-June, 1930.

Durčanský, F.: **L'Europe Central dans le passé et dans l'avenir**, La revue de droit international, de sciences diplomatiques et politiques, Geneve, XXII, année, no. 1, 1944.

Durčanský, F.: **Márne sa snaží Moskva ziskat' Slovákov (The Futile Efforts of Moscow to Win Over the Slovaks)**, Literárny Almanach Slováka v Amerike, an Almanach published in Chicago by the publishers of the SLOVÁK V AMERIKE, a newspaper in the Slovak language, Chicago, 1953.

Chudoba, B.: **Czechoslovakia: A Study in Disintegration**, Thought, Fordham University Quarterly, March, 1950.

Clementis, V.: **Ni satelite de l'U.R.S.S. ni artisan d'un bloc slave**, Parallele 50, Paris, September 20, 1950.

Gosiorovský, M.: **O Sovietoch na Slovensku v roku 1919 (About the Soviets in Slovakia in 1919)**, Nová mysl (The New Thought), Prague, September, 1919.

Hlinka, A.: **Mémoirs des Slovaques à la Conférence de la Paix**, A Memorandum to the Peace Conference in Paris, 1919.

Kirschbaum, J.: **Slovakia and Central European Federation Plans**, SLOVAKIA, a periodical published by the Slovak League of America, Middletown, Pa., April, 1953.

Pir, A. V.: **America's Slovak Societies**, published in the Bulletin of the Slovak National Council Abroad, Middletown, Pa., August, 1956.

Náboženská štatistika (Religious Statistics), Kalendár Kanadskej Slovenskej Ligy (Almanach of the Canadian Slovak League), Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1953.

Schlesinger, R.: **Slovakia Today and Tomorrow**, Contemporary Review, London, August, 1939.

ARTICLES IN NEWSPAPERS

Pravda (The Truth), an official paper of the Communist Party in Slovakia. **Samostatnosť pre Slovensko** (Independence For Slovakia), Bratislava, May 30, 1926.

Pravda Chudoby (The Truth of the Downtrodden), a Czech, Communist paper. **Národní hnutí a komunistická strana Československa (National Movements and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia)**, Prague, June 30, 1924.

Rudé právo (The Red Law), an official paper of the Czech Communist Party. **Odhálení zrádce** (The Traitors Uncovered), Prague, February 27, 1951.

Slovák, a paper published by the Slovak Liberation Committee in Munich, Germany. **Autonomná vláda pre Slovensko?** (An Autonomous Government For Slovakia?), Munich, June, 1956.

• • •

FATHER SEGINAK'S IMPRESSIONS OF PRAGUE AND PREŠOV

"A visit behind the Iron Curtain can best be characterized by the feeling that one is seeing the living-dead." With these words, Father Theodore Seginak, O.S.B., superior of the Benedictine Fathers' Holy Trinity Priory, described his recent visit to Prague in Bohemia and Prešov in Slovakia. After attending a meeting of all the Benedictine superiors of the world in Rome from September 18 to 26, Father Seginak was accompanied by Father Alexander Minchik, O.S.B., on the trip behind the Iron Curtain.

Visas for the trip behind the Iron Curtain are most difficult to obtain. Only after repeated requests had been made did the two priests receive the necessary permission to visit. Even so only two times a week can flights from Vienna to Prague be had. At the Prague airport a thorough search of all apparel was made, as well as a close scrutiny of all money brought into the country. The customs officials demanded to see everything, and sternly warned the two priests that on their return journey they would be required to show a receipt for all purchases made during their visit.

The streets of Prague were filled with sullen, downcast persons who performed their duties with a mechanical precision. One always had the feeling that the eyes of the communist "big brother" were on you. In fact, it is routine in restaurants to sit down to a meal and look up to see a policeman gaping in the window at the diners. The very best meal is steak — which is really hamburger with an egg on top.

Father Seginak was amazed at the prices of clothing and the very poor quality. An American \$45 suit costs

approximately \$175 — if the ordinary persons can afford to buy them. Cheap sweaters cost \$35, and shoes cost \$30. In general, Father Seginak notes, the populace is dressed in a markedly drab manner.

The trip to Prešov was made in a two engine plane. Since it was dark when the plane was landing, Father Seginak remarked to his traveling companion how bumpy the landing was. "Little wonder," said Father Michnik, "look out the window, we're landing in a cow pasture." There was no concrete or asphalt runway — just a muddy field. This was the Prešov airport.

Upon landing the first impression was the number of policemen and soldiers who guarded the field with machine guns. A bus immediately picked up the plane passengers and hustled them through guarded areas. One could not help but feel that they didn't want prying eyes to ferret out some sort of dark secret to be found there. Loudspeakers were in prominence everywhere. The presence of the hammer and sickle with an abundance of red stars left little doubt as to who ran the country.

In Prešov itself there is but one hotel at which one may stay — the Hotel Dukla. There is inconvenience after inconvenience. The telephone may be used only between the hours of 8 a. m. and 6 p. m. The radio in the threadbare room did little to relieve the monotony — one station blared forth propaganda incessantly.

Contrary to the idea the communists would like to foist upon the world that it is the land of the workers' paradise — the raw facts of life do not substantiate it. A 57-year-old woman told of how she began her day at 4 a. m., and after a two mile walk to the potato field she worked until darkness. For lunch she was permitted to build a fire and eat a few of the potatoes with bread and barley coffee. Meat in the diet is simply non-existent.

An 80-year-old woman was assigned the task of caring for the chickens and livestock. The chickens were given a communist mandate to produce a certain quota of eggs — or else. The "or else" meant that the 80-year-old woman was forced to beg, borrow or steal the eggs if her quota was not filled. In the communist scheme of things four-

fifths of a head of steer belongs to the government. Which fifth belongs to the down-trodden peasants was not made too clear. If a head of steer dies the peasant is held responsible and must replace it. By this arrangement the government never loses.

The homes of the village people are very poor. In a four-room house it is ordinary to quarter two families. They use a common kitchen and each family has one room. This apparently is Khrushchev's idea of perfect living quarters for the working people while he enjoys his dacha outside Moscow. There is no running water, heating is primitive, and sidewalks are non-existent. Electricity has been promised — probably for the purpose of installing more loudspeakers to drone the glories of communism incessantly. American movies are not shown — for fear that the populace would see how well Americans live. It is a fact that the people have been led to believe utter poverty reigns in the United States.

The ruthless persecution of the Byzantine Catholic Church in the Prešov district has taken its toll. One example is given of the village priest who was called by a well-dressed man from the confessional on Holy Saturday. He claimed he had spiritual problems. The priest walked with him a short distance where an armored car and two motorcycles whisked him away. He was never heard from again. A communist agent in the guise of an Orthodox priest took his place. The people do not attend the church now because they know that the "priest" in reality is a communist spy in their midst.

With a great deal of relief did the two priests leave this land of the living-dead. As tourists they had been warned to take no maps with them, have no prayer books and stay away from relatives, lest they implicate them as spies against the peoples' government. Father Minchik remarked to his superior that one never leaves an Iron Curtain country quite the same person he was upon entering it. A hatred and revulsion for the tyranny of communism seems to pervade a person's soul after a close contact with this social sickness of our day. — "Byzantine Catholic World."

THE KREMLIN HAS SHOWN ITS HAND

Joseph Cieker

It seems that the politicians, who have led and are still leading the destinies of the present time, have been charmed by some kind of enchantresses. They are unable to free themselves from the snares which had been placed for them by Communism. Nay, it would rather seem that the more it appears that they are getting free of them, the more they are really being entangled by them. Not that Communism has changed its content and its substance. Its substance and its goal is always the same. Only the strategy and tactics of Communism change. If leading political factors had actually devoted themselves responsibly and directly to the study of Communism, they would have undoubtedly found a definite course of action against it. The fact is that they have not. They rather concerned themselves with its strategy and tactics. And the latter governed to a great extent their policies and diplomacy. Thus we were witnesses of the strategic and tactical squables, which perhaps, at times, led to temporary results, but in substance did not contribute to the solution of world Communism, which as a phenomenon simply will not be disputed or debated away and thereby even less to be minimized. Every strategic and tactical move of Communism is reacted to with more or less success, but the burden of the problem remains unchanged on the lives of nations. In fact the burden becomes greater with time. If these so-called victories of international non-Communist politics really were equal to the criteria which had been brought forth in connection with the various diplomatic reactions to the strategic and tactical undertakings of the Red Kremlin, then the power of international Communism would already have been broken. The fact that this power has not been broken is evidence of the fact that the victories were merely of a peripheral significance, and as such were frequently noted as brilliant actions of experimental patrols. We still have not sunk our teeth into the reality and substance of international Communism and into the body of the international policy of the Soviet Union.

Communism certainly is not a secret organization. Neither is the politics of the Soviet Union. Entire libraries could be filled with literature about what Communism is, what it wants, and just how it aims to attain its ultimate goal. However, even if this literature did not exist, we have before us the work of 40 years of international Communism and of the international politics of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, despite all this, leading politicians and diplomats of the West — with a few exceptions — have yet to prove that they are seriously concerned about what Communism writes, talks, and does. As if all this were some sort of witchcraft. Beginning with Lenin and ending with Khruschchev the basic principles of Communism have been clearly stated to the whole world. Leading figures of Communism have sworn time and again that they shall never abandon their goal no matter what the cost. They announced this by means of all possible forms. But it seems that the world deliberately closed its ears, so that it would not have to hear and then believe, and finally so that it would not have to proceed to serious and principal decisions.

As an explanation let it suffice now to quote in this connection a part of a statement of a Soviet intellectual, the rector of the political School of Lenin Dmytryj Manuilsky, made twenty-eight years ago. During the past three decades many substantial changes have taken place in the Europe and world structure. During this time, international Communism has made far-reaching steps in its march to its ultimate goal. In 1931, Manuilsky, lecturing to the undergraduates of Moscow's Lenin School, said:

War to the hilt between Communism and Capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. The bourgeoisie will have to be lulled to sleep first. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement in history. We shall make resounding declarations for the benefit of peace, friendship, and mutual international sympathies. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will be overjoyed to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be our friends. As soon as their guard is down and they are drunk with gullibility, we shall leap on them and smash them with our fists.

Nikita Khruschchev, the most experienced coexisten-

tialist — noticing in 1955 that his speeches and recommendations in regard to coexistence are being explained altogether unilaterally by non-Communists for their own benefit and as a guarantee of permanent comfort, hurried to make the following clear:

"It is true that we are adherents of coexistence, but at the same time we are also adherents of the expansion of Communism over the entire world. We are faced with the reality of the existence of two different systems in the world. You, the Capitalists, insist that you shall go your own way. You will do that until the day you realize that this has led you into a blind alley out of which there is no exit. Since you stubbornly hold to the idea that your system is not ancient and decadent enough, and since you think that you can compete with us, well, we have nothing against this. Time will prove who was right."

Communism has placed its cards on the table to be seen by all in the game. It has shoved them under the very noses of its fellow players. For long decades it has never changed its game. It keeps on hammering the same tune all the time: we shall destroy you! But the non-Communist world keeps whistling its own tune as it enters the blind alley from which there will be no way out — as Nikita Khruschchev so clearly pointed out. The non-Communist world apparently still does not have sufficient proof of what Communism really is and what it aims to attain. Stubbornly it keeps on asking the Kremlin to say it again. And then once again. After so many encores, the non-Communist world still is looking for some kind of a change of heart of the Kremlin. Perhaps, it thinks, after all these smiles there will follow a revision of the entire Communist program. And who can say definitely that a palace revolution in the Kremlin, or a quarrel between members of the Politbureau, or the fall of a Soviet Marshal, or a quarrel between Peking and Moscow, will not force a change of the ultimate goal? Wishful, useless thinking!

All the questions which the non-Communist world has put and will put to the Kremlin have already been answered. At least the principal questions have been clearly answered. The others, the answers to peripheral questions, do not matter, because the problem posed by international Communism cannot be solved by them.

ELEVEN HUNDRED YEARS OF PRAYERFUL SONG

A Survey of Slovak Church Music

BY SISTER M. PASCHAL, SS. C. M.

Characterized from the very dawn of history as a singing people, the Slovaks readily consecrated this talent to God's service when the glad tidings of the Gospel were brought to them more than eleven hundred years ago. Christianization of the Slovaks dates back to the ninth century, to the consecration of the first Catholic church, built by Prince Pribina in Nitra in 833. Thereafter, down through the centuries, the Slovak people have been praising God with hymns and songs. In prosperity and in adversity, in the humble church of an obscure village as well as in a baroque cathedral like that of Košice, at the simple tasks about the home as well as on festive pilgrimages, centuries ago as well as in our own day the hymn and the chant are offered to God by generation after generation of Slovak Catholics.

In recent times Slovak congregational singing attracted considerable attention during the pilgrimages which the Federation of Slovak Catholics sponsored to shrines in Canada, New York, Philadelphia, Scranton, and Washington, D. C. Onlookers were frankly amazed at the spectacle. Rarely, if ever, had they seen such large groups united in prayerful song. It is truly an inspiration to hear the Slovaks sing at their religious services especially where there is congregational participation.

How did the ancestors of Modern Slovaks develop their religious music and how closely does it follow the spirit of the liturgy? From the earliest Christian era the Catholic Church has solicitously guarded the art and purity of music in Her public worship. In this respect Church authorities in Slovakia were exceptionally vigilant. The Byzantine rite with its exquisitely melodic liturgy was introduced among the Slovaks by SS. Cyril and Methodius in 863. Through their apostles the Slovak people likewise learned to foster a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, a devotion which is so deeply rooted among the

Slovaks that in most of their churches it is still customary for the Rosary Society to sing Marian hymns in public procession after High Mass on the first Sunday of the month.

The saintly brothers translated the missal (*Kievsky misál*), the ritual (*Euchologium Sinajské*), the breviary and a collection of liturgical hymns (*strumicky oktoich*) into Old Slavonic. When they visited Rome to confer with the Holy Father, Pope Adrian II placed these liturgical books on the Blessed Virgin's altar and blessed them. Then he permitted SS. Cyril and Methodius to use the Slavonic language in the liturgy. "Hospodine, pomiluj ny," whose author very likely was St. Methodius himself, is the only hymn preserved from that period.

For several centuries the development of religious music was halted by persecutions directed against the Old Slavonic liturgy and sterile period followed. By the twelfth century, however, various diocesan synods began to approve directives for liturgical singing. A summary of the most important of these would include the following:

In 1114 the Synod of Ostrihom legislated that only hymns approved by Church authorities be used in the churches.

In 1494 the Synod of Nitra directed that Holy Mass be accompanied with singing in all parish churches.

The Synod of Trnava in 1560 commanded under pain of censure that no hymns either in the vernacular or in Latin be admitted for church use unless it could be ascertained that they had been approved by ecclesiastical authorities over a hundred years ago, lest the faithful by their very attraction to exercises of devotion be misled into heresy.

In 1638 the Synod of Trnava charged a committee of competent musicians to collect liturgical hymns sung by the people and have them presented to Church authorities for approval and publication. This measure was needed to guard against the infiltration of Protestant influence which tried to establish itself with the seventeenth century's creation and importation of new homes. Composers of proved merit contributed to standard collections of

Slovak hymns and preserved acceptable manuscript copies. One such manuscript collection was **Antifonae et cantiones variae cum notis musicis Slavonice et latine**. It comprises 338 sheets of copy. Another which is dated 1657 was **Cantilenae conventus Lauritani ord. Serv. B. V. M.**

An even greater revival was brought about when the Slovak Jesuits founded the Catholic University of Trnava in 1635. In accordance with the prescriptions of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) they collected the ancient Slovak liturgical hymns and prepared for the press the first printed Slovak hymnal **Cantus Catholici**. It was published in two editions: in 1655 and in 1700 and it has been proved that its compiler was a Slovak Jesuit, Benedikt Szollossi (1609-1656).

Cantus Catholici has three hundred eighteen pages of unisonous hymns. Of these, sixty-two are Latin and two hundred twenty-seven are Slovak. In 1937 Mikulas Schneider-Trnavsky revived about seventy hymns from the three-hundred-year-old **Cantus Catholici** by introducing a modernized form of them in the **Jednotný katolícky spevník** of which we shall speak presently.

Cantus Catholici is uniquely valuable from the musical standpoint inasmuch as its sources are traceable to Gregorian Chant. The ancient Slovak hymns preserved in it exemplify the use of tropes among the Slavs as early as the close of the Middle Ages. Tropes, of course, are a more or less poetical commentary that is woven into the liturgical text, forming with it a complete unit; it is an interpolation in a liturgical text or the embellishment brought about by such interpolation, that is, insertions or additions.

Let us take the Kyrie Eleison from the Ordinary of the Mass as an example. On the last syllable of the "Kyrie" where a melisma was sung, a phrase or a stanza was composed to fit the melisma. In this way some additional text was inserted between the "Kyrie" and the "eleison." Consequently, a melismatic **Kyrie** had nine stanzaic insertions. The Gregorian **Kyrie II** in mode 3 carried this interpolation thus: Kyrie — fons bonitatis, Pater ingeniti, a quo cuncta procedunt — eleison. The **Cantus Catholici** has a

closely paralleled translation of this interpolation: Hos-podine, studnice dobrötj, Otce nerozený, od teba wssecko dobre pocházi — smiluj sa nad nami. This is one example of how the ancient vernacular hymns of the Slovaks were developed in Gregorian style, characterized principally by the use of modal modulations and cadences ending on the dominant. It is interesting to note that a number of Slovak folk songs (of which there are some 40,000) were also developed in the same manner.

The Latin preface of the **Cantus Catholici** points out the fact that the liturgy was performed in the vernacular at the altar and in choir. The hymns and psalms taught in church were frequently repeated with much spirit at recreation and feasts, in the vineyards and in the field.

In the course of time manuscripts of church music were collected by interested individuals. Outstanding among the composers and compilers were Pavlin Bajan (1783), a Franciscan; and later Andrej Radlinsky and Frantisek Sasinek, two priests who made a noteworthy contribution by their 1872 publication of *Všeobecná sbierka cirkevných katolíckych pesničiek slovenských*, which contained 1,047 hymns. The Society of St. Adalbert commissioned Frantisek Matzenauer, a priest director, and Joseph Mathulay, an organist, to write the accompaniments for the above mentioned collection. The result was *Duchovny spevník katolícky* (1882). In response to the November 22, 1903 "Motu Proprio" of St. Pius X, a national hymnal entitled *Nábožný kresťan* containing 400 hymns was compiled by Msgr. Andrej Hlinka and Joseph Chladek in 1906.

A unique contribution to Catholic Slovak hymnody is the voluminous *Jednotný katolícky spevník* (1937). It was projected at a meeting held by the Society of St. Adalbert on March 8, 1921, when in the presence of three newly consecrated Slovak bishops and at their direction it was resolved to compile and publish a new hymnal. Mikuláš Schneider-Trnavský, a highly reputable Slovak composer, was commissioned to harmonize and arrange the Slovak hymns. Committees on liturgy, literature, and hymnody collaborated with Schneider-Trnavský in this re-

sponsible undertaking. For ten years they devoted themselves to the dedicated work of collecting the treasures of Slovak Church music, to discriminate, to discard whatever might be classified as undesirable and to preserve or to restore all that was worthy. The Committees observed the directives contained in the "Motu Proprio" of Pope Pius X and in the "Apostolic Constitution (December 22, 1928) of Pope Pius XI. The extensive bibliography enumerates references to thirty-three printed hymnals and one-hundred-four printed manuals and prayer books; six manuscript collections of hymns without melodies and ten manuscript collections with melodies. All these were studied with scholarly diligence.

Of the five hundred forty-one hymns listed in the index of the **Jednotný katolícky spevník** those devoted to Christmas, Lent, the Blessed Sacrament, and the Blessed Virgin Mary are most largely represented. The contents are arranged according to the liturgical year with specific recommendations for the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, for liturgical processions, and for various other religious functions. Out of consideration for the needs of the congregation, the limitations of school children, and the abilities of trained choirs who would use the hymnal, the compiler also included carols, hymns for pilgrimages, chor-al Slovak Mass hymns, and Latin hymns.

It may be asked what qualities characterize Slovak liturgical and religious hymns. Careful study will show that it is their singular charm to have those very characteristics which are recommended in the "Musicae Sacrae Disciplina" (December 25, 1955) of Pope Pius XII. Slovak hymns confirm fully to Christian teaching, they use simple tunes and simple words, and they possess religious dignity and becoming gravity. They make no provisions for brilliant solos, they exhibit no florid styles, no elaborate cadences, no suggestive worldliness or sentimentality to distract the devotion of the worshippers.

The music of the Mass hymns is consonant with the religious expression contained in the texts of the Ordinary of the Mass. As a matter of fact the very text of the

Mass hymns is a close paraphrase of the text of the Ordinary. These Mass hymns are still sung in Slovak parish churches both in America and abroad during the Missa Cantata. By them the choir and the congregation are enabled to unite closely with the priest in the sacred action of the Mass.

Most of the hymns for Lent and Advent are written in a minor tonality and express sincere expectation, longing, love, hope, and sorrow. Diatonic progressions and sequential melodic passages make the tunes naturally singable, and the inert musical signs of the Christmas and Easter hymns come to life best when they are sung and played by souls radiating a great love for God. Marian hymns expand the praises sung in honor of the Mother of God to very numerous lines comprising more than one hundred hymns. Generally the refrain reiterates the message of her feasts or a particular supplication. Hymns in honor of the Blessed Sacrament and the Saints as well as pilgrimages and processional hymns vary in their messages and expressions but they retain the same commendable simplicity of melody subordinated to the prayerfulness of the words.

The melodic structure of the Chant depends on the accent which is the soul of the Latin word. Slovak vernacular hymns which are reliable translations from Latin texts are easily adapted to Gregorian Chant since the accent and the word order of the Slovak language readily correspond to the Latin original in very many instances. A few hymns that illustrate this adaptability from Latin to Slovak are:

- Stabat Mater — Stála Matka (Sequence)
- Lauda Sion — Chvál' Sione (Sequence)
- Pange Lingua — Javte ústa
- Adore Te — Klaniam sa Ti
- Jesu Dulcis — Jezu sladký

The genuineness and the excellence of Slovak hymn tones was recognized by such an authority as Nicola A. Montani, the compiler of the **Saint Gregory Hymnal** (1920).

Mr. Montani incorporated into this American hymn book over twenty Slovak hymn tunes for which he adapted English texts and one setting for the "Tantum Ergo."

In his encyclical on sacred music the late Pope Pius XII mentioned that hymns are effective in the religious instruction of boys and girls. It is worthy of mention that children in Slovakia sang their catechism at least as early as 1913. Andrej Cambal, a Slovak Jesuit, translated into Slovak the catechism hymns originally used by Ignac Parhamer, a Jesuit missionary who instructed the people of Austria-Hungary in the eighteenth century. In his preface Father Cambal wrote: "I present this Catechism to you in song, that you may learn Christian Doctrine in a delightful manner and have it well impressed upon your minds."

This survey may help to show how rich is the heritage of sacred music which has been preserved by the Slovak people, who justly pride themselves on having 2,000 hymns in their treasury of music. These hymns are the expression of the mind and heart of the Church regarding sacred music. They also embody the joyous and prayerful spirit of a singing people.

(Caecilia, Vol. 85, No. 2)

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"President Benes was always of the opinion, and in his latest statements always stressed, that our pact of alliance with Soviet Russia and our friendship with other Slav nations must not encroach on our friendly and cordial relations with other democratic states. This is the natural desire, shared by an enormous majority of our people, and nothing prevents us from keeping the confidence of the democratic states and strengthening and deepening our friendship with our great western Allies. Moscow, too, wants to follow this line of policy. It will, however, be necessary for certain prejudices of the West with regard to the Soviet Union, which are still existing, to be swept away." — **Premier Fierlinger** of Czechoslovakia, OWI Bulletin, June 1, 1945.

STEPHEN OSUSKÝ AND MARCH 1939**Francis Vnuk**

The same day that German divisions entered Bohemia and Moravia (March 15) and Hitler parked himself in the Hradčany, Weizsaecker, German State Secretary, sent a circular to all German foreign missions in countries, in which Czechoslovakia had diplomatic representation, to be ready to take over Prague diplomatic services. Particularly, the persons concerned were to see to it that all political and secret material was safeguarded. Hitler made the matter public on March 16, 1939, and the Czech Foreign Minister Chvalkovský issued instructions the same afternoon to the effect that all foreign offices of the Czechoslovak Republic ceased to function as such and were to be surrendered to the German foreign offices in the respective countries.

We know that not all foreign representations of Prague followed Chvalkovský's directive. The deciding factor here was not Chvalkovský's order (after all he was only doing what the Germans wanted him to do), but the stand taken toward Germany by the respective countries. In neutral countries and those which sympathized with Germany, the order was carried out without complications. Not so, however, where the mood was anti-German. Chvalkovský's order was thus ignored in Washington, London, Paris, Moscow, Warsaw, and in Santiago. In three instances the diplomats were of Slovak origin: Vladimír Hurban in Washington, George Slávik in Warsaw, and Stephen Osuský in Paris.

The case of Stephen Osuský is most interesting and perhaps least known. We know what had happened in Warsaw and in Washington. But little or nothing about what had transpired in Paris at the time. Perhaps because of Osuský's influence. Now, what did happen in Paris at the time?

Welczek, the German Ambassador in Paris, did try to contact Osuský, though unsuccessfully, after he had received Weizsaecker's directive. Late in the afternoon of

March 16th, however, a member of the German Embassy (Braeuer) did contact Černý of the Czechoslovak Embassy and explained the implication of Hitler's decree. Černý was satisfied with Braeuer's explanation, but informed him — though he and the rest of the staff were ready to do what was asked of them — they could do nothing without Osuský, who, they said, still had no made up his mind on the matter. In the evening the Germans finally did get to Osuský by phone. Quirring, the German Embassy's legal counsel, first talked to him and later Welczek himself. Osuský took the stand that preliminarily he could not surrender the Embassy because he had learned about Hitler's proclamation, he said, only from the newspapers and officially he had nothing from Prague. Furthermore, he added that he needed a certain amount of time to let the French Government know in an appropriate manner what had happened. Welczek took cognizance of this but reminded Osuský, in order that there be no doubt about the matter, that the situation is completely clear and that Osuský bears full responsibility for his rejective attitude to surrender the embassy and its contents. Osuský, however, took exception and denied the accusation that he had taken a rejective stand on the matter. For the reason mentioned, he said, he simply could not surrender the embassy.

On the second day (March 17), Welczek again contacted Osuský. This time Osuský admitted that he had received the directive from Prague but that he would have to discuss the situation with the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs which still regarded him as the responsible head of the Czechoslovak Embassy because it had not been informed about the new situation. Welczek retorted that he had informed the French Government in writing about the new situation and, therefore, Osuský should know what he is supposed to do. Osuský replied that he would go to the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and then let the German Embassy know about the matter of surrendering his post. Dusk turned into darkness, but no report came from Osuský.

Naturally, the Germans were becoming impatient.

When they called Osuský's office, they were told he was not in. Neither was his secretary. They decided then to visit Osuský's office. When they came to the building and found that it was heavily guarded by the French police, they left without further pursuing their mission.

In the meantime, Černý (the Czech Embassy's legal counsel) made an appearance at the German Embassy to report that he and the other personnel of the Czechoslovak Embassy did not identify themselves with Osuský and that they told Osuský openly they did not agree with his position. Furthermore, when he told Osuský that he would let the Germans know how the personnel felt about the matter, Osuský replied that he could not prevent him (Černý) from doing so, but that he (Osuský) needed time to arrange his affairs before he surrendered the office. After that, according to Černý, Osuský would be indifferent to what would happen. Černý also assured the Germans that "tomorrow (March 18), he would again tell Osuský that the embassy personnel urgently requests that he surrender the embassy to the Germans.

But the Germans knew that Černý meant little in the situation. If the French authorities are back of Osuský, the latter certainly would not be guided by what Černý and the Czech Embassy personnel recommended. And there were signs that Osuský did have the backing of the French for his stand. Welczek recalled that the position of the French Foreign Ministry heralded nothing good when it was handed the notification of Hitler's decree. At that time Charvériat, head of the political division of the French Foreign Ministry indicated that French official circles did not regard the situation as clear and consistent. Complications arose, Charvériat said, because the Czechoslovak Embassy also represented Slovakia and Ruthenia, while the Germans made a Protectorate only of Bohemia and Moravia. The French Government, continued Charvériat, wishes therefore to carefully look into all the implications and devote proper attention to the position of the Czechoslovak Embassy. Rushing matters would only increase the suspicion of the French, Charvériat concluded. The Germans answered that the French have no business

investigating this matter, because it concerns exclusively only Osuský and Welczek as the only representative of Germany.

Encouraged by French assurances, Osuský stubbornly stood his ground. German hopes to take over the Czech Embassy faded. However, after (March 23) the TEMPS published a telegram in which Osuský sought the help of Herriot. It was obvious that the telegram was inspired by French circles. Osuský then told journalists (and the French press gave this wide publicity) that he was remaining in the embassy to continue to represent the interests of his countrymen in France. The French Government then assured Osuský that it would continue to recognize him as the accredited ambassador so that he could keep on looking after the interests of Czecho-Slovakia.

These interests, however, could not relate to the Czecho-Slovak Republic which factually did not exist. Osuský could hold his position because there were some 50,000 former Czecho-Slovak citizens in France, the overwhelming majority of whom were Slovaks. They were concentrated in the environs of Paris, Strassburg, and Lille. How did Osuský protect their interests? By forcing them to join the Czecho-Slovak Legion!

As a result of French action, the Germans were not even able to take over the Czech consulates in France. What happened with Černý and the embassy personnel for whom he spoke? He changed his "line" after the publication of Osuský's telegram in the French press, so that everything and everybody at the Czecho-Slovak Embassy came into line with Osuský.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"The Peace Policy of the USSR — Our Alliance," is the theme of the lecture which will be delivered by Minister Dr. Hubert Ripka in the Prague Central Library on Friday, October 31, 1947, at 7:30 P. M. The lecture is being sponsored by the Committee for the Celebration of the 30th Anniversary of the Revolution." (The Czech SVOBODNÉ SLOVO, 10-30-47).

OSUSKÝ AFTER MARCH 14, 1939**Constantine Čulen**

I have read Vnuk's article on Osuský in the Slovak press and believe it in the interest of historians to enlarge upon it, since I have quite a file on Osuský, the man who was delegated by the Slovak League of America to do a certain job for it in 1916 (to get the story in Europe of what was to be done with Austria-Hungary at the end of World War 1 and, particularly, to see what could be done to liberate the Slovaks from the hegemony of Budapest), but thusfar has failed to report his findings to the League. Now, how did Osuský, a Slovak who found favor with T. G. Masaryk, protect the interests of his fellow-Slovaks in France? Let me tell you how he tried to make cannon fodder of them for the French in the last war.

After Germany attacked France, Osuský began to organize a new Czecho-Slovak army in France, knowing that some 50,000 Slovaks had settled there. In the years when thousands upon thousands of Czechs poured into Slovakia to help the "backward, primitive" Slovaks, thousands upon thousands of Slovaks were forced to seek their bread in foreign lands. France was one of the countries where the Slovaks settled in larger numbers.

Osuský was a politician who had two irons in th fire. Thus he began his political career, and thus he ended it. Whenever he made one of his rare appearances in Slovakia, his "homeland," Osuský would turn radical and make a speech on how the Slovaks were being mistreated by Prague. On to Prague he would then go and do some smooth explaining so that his Prague boss would not be angry with him.

In the fall of 1938, Osuský same to Prague and sought the favor of the deputies of the Slovak People's Party. He delivered a long address to the Club of Deputies and Senators in which he did not treat Eduard Beneš and Milan Hodža too kindly. Osuský was the protégé of Masaryk, while Hodža, also of Slovak origin, was in favor with Beneš. It was no secret that Osuský had hoped to become the Foreign Minister of Czecho-Slovakia. The address, how-

ever, fell short of its mark. After Osuský left the Club, Tiso, later President of the Slovak Republic, remarked amusingly: "The discharged maid came to complain about her mistress." The Populists agreed that Hodža could answer Osuský in the Club. Hodža, however, let one of his friends answer Osuský.

Osuský and the Czechs

Stephen Osuský remained in Paris where he began to organize the "liberation" movement, but behind the scenes he was also opposed to Beneš. With the Czechs under Beneš, Osuský was a member of Beneš's "Czecho-Slovak National Committee," and yet he intervened with French authorities so that Daladier would not accept Beneš as the head of the movement. Beneš was furious. And it was Beneš who told an American correspondent that Osuský is a link between Daladier and the Habsburg Otto. As a result, Czech emigrants turned against Osuský, calling him a traitor, a contemptible man, and a careerist who had, they said, "thrown himself out of the liberation movement."

Did France Betray Czecho-Slovakia?

Osuský lived so long in France that he finally became a Frenchman in spirit. After Munich, leading Czech personalities unhesitatingly declared that France had betrayed Czecho-Slovakia. When the Czechs and Slovaks in France let it be known that they felt the same way, the French Government warned Osuský that it had enough of such "bad conduct." Osuský replied publicly in the newspapers, berating his countrymen for their "unbecoming" conduct. "In one's own home," Osuský said, "no one allows himself to be called a traitor. A traitor is an enemy. To call the French enemies and at the same time live among them and accept their hospitality, this is something that cannot be borne well. It simply was not true," concluded Osuský, "and France is the Mother of our freedom and independence."

The First "State Act"

Of course, Osuský had to show his appreciation to the French Government for letting him keep the Czecho-

Slovak Embassy. France needed soldiers. There were thousands of Slovak workers in France, and Osuský gave them the choice of sacrificing themselves for France or going to a concentration camp. In his press, of course, Osuský said this "diplomatically" thusly: "Czecho-Slovak citizens here in France have the right to think and to give expression to their thoughts. They have a right to look after their own livelihood and to care for their own welfare." A "Proclamation" form was then issued in Czech, which the Slovak and Czechs were supposed to sign and return to Osuský's office. This was to be proof that the men were signing up "voluntarily" and without reservations for a Czecho-Slovak army, and the women for whatever duties might be assigned to them by the Czecho-Slovak Foreign Center. As one Slovak put it: "They are forcing us to die for something that is foreign but even this verdict of death cannot be published in Slovak, but in Czech!"

The Slovaks in France

Argenteuil, a suburb of Paris, was a center of Slovak national and cultural life. Over 1,000 Slovaks lived there. They were "stubborn" Slovaks, who would not be influenced by Czech or "Czechoslovak" propaganda. They had their own Slovak school. Prague tried unsuccessfully to place a Czech teacher. Finally a Slovak was appointed. Of course, he was not an autonomist. All the Argenteuil Slovaks, however, backed the right of the Slovaks to autonomy, that is, to home rule or to states' rights. They never had any trouble with the French authorities before Germany invaded Bohemia and Moravia. But plenty after Beneš, Ján Masaryk and other Czech "patriots" with their Slovak helpers went into exile. The cry went out to organize a "Czechoslovak" resistance.

The chief problem was to organize an army in France. After months of agitation among the Slovaks, five volunteered to join the Czecho-Slovak Legion in France. A round-up of Slovaks began; all capable of bearing arms were brought by the police to the Police Commissioner where they were ordered to sign up with the Czecho-Slovak Le-

gion. Excepting the five mentioned, all other refused to do so. Those that were citizens of France were willing to answer the call from the authorities when it was issued, but refused to sign up for the Czecho-Slovak Legion. The result was that some were jailed, while many others were placed in concentration camps at Rolland Garros, Buffalo Bill, and still others were relegated to forced labor on the Spanish frontier. Fathers of families were not excepted. Beneš and Osuský had to have an army.

The hapless Slovaks were then visited by agents of the Paris Czechoslovak Office who urged them to "get smart" and sign up for the Legion. The Slovaks, however, resisted stubbornly, asking: "for what?" Letters, sent to relatives in Slovakia, told of the suffering they undergo because they refused to fight against their brethren in Slovakia who had as much right to freedom and independence as Beneš and his Czechs. Their attitude was like that of the French in Quebec, Canada.

That is how they began to organize the Czechoslovak Legion in France. Much was said about it. Czech propaganda wrote about thousands and tens of thousands joining up "voluntarily and enthusiastically." The periodical "*Česko-Slovenský boj*" (The Czechoslovak Struggle) reported on the "Departure of our First Defenders": 160 men and ten officers under the command of Captain Krátky; three companies headed by two battalions. In the meantime Prchala and Šnejdárek, both Czech Generals, were waiting for something to do.

Osuský Vs. Beneš

After Slovakia proclaimed her independence on March 14, 1939, and the Czech lands were occupied by the Germans, it seemed that Osuský and Beneš would become reconciled. In America Beneš praised Osuský for organizing the new resistance movement in France. But Osuský apparently did not want to be a subordinate of Beneš who had capitulated to Hitler at Munich. Backed by the French, who wanted Beneš to lose himself, Osuský wanted the No.

1 spot as far as Czecho-Slovak leadership abroad was concerned.

On July 29, 1939, the "Česko-Slovenský Boj" published the July 10th resolution of "Osuský's countrymen" who had settled in Grand Combe, wherein they acknowledged the leadership of Osuský and expressed full confidence in him. The Ruthenians followed suit. Pamphlets sharply critical of Beneš were circulated among the Slovaks in France. In his propaganda organ, Osuský began to write about the need of a new and different Czecho-Slovakia, unlike the old one. He said that generals who lost the war do have the obligation to continue working, but that they did not have any right at all to lead the Slovaks and Czechs into a new fight. He did not consider himself as one of the generals who lost the war. The new resistance, it was said, must be imbued with a new spirit and must be lead by new leaders ("Slovenský Ľud" — Buenos Aires, May 18, 1939).

In the "Česko-Slovenský Boj" of June 10, 1939, he wrote about the situation and feelings of the Slovaks in Czecho-Slovakia. "The fact is," Osuský said, "that many Slovaks do not believe in the legal continuity of the Czecho-Slovak Republic and in its restoration, because some Slovaks and Czechs threaten the Slovak with even a tougher and more ruthless centralism than the one they lived under for twenty years." Osuský recalled that he had protested against the policy followed in Slovakia. "I recall that in the fall of 1937, a year before the catastrophe," Osuský declared, "I had foretold in official places the end of the Republic if a radical change and improvement did not take place." Rigid centralism — the cause of so many quarrels between the Slovaks and Czechs — is burried and dead, and "I hereby publicly state that I shall never agree to have the Slovak nation robbed of its sacred rights... We are here concerned with the existence and the future of the Czecho-Slovak Republic," continued Osuský, and "whosoever threatens the Slovaks with centralism is an enemy of the restoration of the Republic, and that for the reason that without the Slovaks Czecho-

Slovakia cannot be and shall not be restored." Diplomatic double talk!

Osuský in London

After the fall of France, Osuský, like Hodža before him, was given the "Beneš treatment" for faithful services rendered: first he was vilified and then dropped. Among other things, Beneš and his political entourage accused Osuský of: using State finances for "other purposes;" sabotaging the evacuation of Czechoslovaks from France; helping Hitler to divide the "Czechoslovak nation" even before Munich; favoring French policy in Munich; and repudiating the "president's" conception of the second resistance movement, according to which Beneš was still president of Czechoslovakia which legally did not cease to exist, and Beneš, therefore is "the sole source of constitutional rights and State sovereignty of Masaryk's first Republic."

The Czech press in America, which up to that time wrote highly of Osuský and his "accomplishments," now turned against him. Osuský now became a Habsburg monarchist, a reactionary, a collaborator of Germans, and declared that he must never be allowed to return to "liberated" Czechoslovakia. In his MEMOIRS, Beneš referred to Osuský and others as "malcontents who, when they wanted to extort something for their personal benefit, used to threaten or attack me (sometimes with extreme lack of decency or political propriety" (p. 121). Beneš expelled Osuský from his London "government-in-exile" in March, 1942, stating, however, that Osuský had "resigned."

"But I did not resign," Osuský hurried to reply, "I was simply dismissed." Not being able to get his side of the story to the West, Osuský published several pamphlets to exonerate himself and indict Beneš and his "illegal" political clique. As far as Osuský was concerned, "Dr. Edward Beneš had resigned from the office of president of the Czechoslovak Republic," and Dr. Emil Hácha was elected according to the Constitution in his stead and, therefore, "legally and in fact Dr. Edward Beneš ceased to be president of the Czechoslovak Republic." Beneš, however, had the right connections in London and Washington. In the end he, and not Osuský, prevailed.

In politics it seldom pays to sit on two chairs. Osuský began his career when the Slovak League sent him to Europe to Masaryk to work for the establishment of Czecho-Slovakia and to see to it that Slovakia was granted autonomy. Osuský found it convenient and profitable to forget the League and the rights of his Slovak people to freedom, freedom from alien domination. He preferred to serve Masaryk and his senseless concept of "Czechoslovakism." At one time it was said that Osuský claimed "credit" for the fact that the Pittsburgh Pact was not even mentioned during the Paris Peace Conference negotiations. Osuský served as a Prague ambassador for over twenty years. He did a commendable job of it. Today, perhaps as he writes his memoirs in Washington, the Czechs don't want him — and the Slovaks, his own people, won't have him.

• • •

The History of Slovakia:

By PHILIP A. HROBAK

(Continued)

Slovakia played an important role in the relations of the kingdom which developed between Hungary and Poland during the reign of the Anjous. Louis the Great wanted to become Polish king after the death of Casimir the Great, the last male descendant of the Piastov Clan. The agreements by which this union of Poland and Hungary was to be realized, were concluded in Slovak cities, especially in Košice which was on the Cracow-Budín highway. It was at Košice, after several meetings, that it was decided to have the daughter of Louis the Great, succeed him to the Polish throne after his death. The reign of the Anjous brought Slovakia a notable contribution especially in the field of culture.

GOTHIC CULTURE IN SLOVAKIA

Medieval culture is a Christian culture. The Church concerned itself not only with the advancement of Christian faith and morals among the uncivilized nations of Europe,

but also that of the cultural life. Christianity changed and ennobled the character of the medieval man who learned to realize that his life's goal was the salvation of his immortal soul. The religious spirit of the medieval person knew how to suffer the difficulties and miseries of this life patiently, because he understood that it was in this valley of tears that he prepared for eternal life. The Christian concept of life elevated the human spirit to God and gave medieval culture a special character. Christian culture of the Middle Ages attained its full development in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries and found beautiful expression in the creative arts in the Gothic style of architecture.

In the beginning the Church was the only organization which fostered culture, the sciences and the arts, educated youth in its parish, capitulary and monastery schools, and also collected rich treasures of artistic creations in its churches. Later, especially from the thirteenth century on, knights became a significant factor in the cultural life of Europe. They endeavored to excell not only in military accomplishments, but also in Christian virtues. From the fourteenth century the cities became important centers of progress, both cultural and spiritual.

Slovakia, because of her geographical position, came under the strong influence of the cultural movements which swept across Central Europe from the second half of the thirteenth century. In Slovakia, Gothic culture reached a high degree of perfection and beauty in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and its final offshoots extend to the sixteenth century. Artistic works, which have been preserved from those times in Slovakia, are proof that cultural life there developed somewhat belatedly, but in its maturity did not remain behind the cultural development of Central Europe.

As everywhere in Europe, so in Slovakia, the first and only centers of culture were the monasteries and other ecclesiastical institutions. Supported generously by the royalty and the nobility, they performed not only a religious, but also a highly worthy cultural mission.

Besides the old abbeys of the Benedictine Order, which originated in Slovakia before the invasion of the Turks, a large number of monasteries and churches of the Order of St. Francis and of the Preachers of St. Dominic were founded in the cities of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Franciscans came from Italy and the Dominicans from Spain. The Premonstratensians and Cistercians originated in France and founded their first monasteries in Slovakia outside the cities. Not only beautiful churches, but also art-shops, trade shops and libraries sprang up near all these institutions. To some of these monasteries and chapters the king granted the right of issuing, transcribing and clarifying documents. Such monasteries were called "trustworthy" places. In Slovakia the following enjoyed that privilege: the Chapters in Bratislava, Nitra and Spiš; the Benedictine abbey of St. Benedict near the Hron, the Premonstratensian monastery in Kláštor-pod-Znievom and in Jasov. Archives originated in these abbeys in which records, various literary works and documents were deposited.

When the Anjous came to the throne in Hungary, and the Luxemburgs to the throne in Bohemia, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, higher western European culture came to Central Europe, which in a twofold way penetrated into the territory of Slovakia. In those times Knighthood developed in Central Europe which with its higher culture and refined morals enlightened and edified the masses of the people. Slovak nobility soon adopted the manner of life of the knights, even to the extent of replacing wooden palisades and fortresses with strong stone citadels with moats, towers and bastions. These castles of the knights, often built on high and impregnable rocks, were not only strongholds, but also witnesses of the active life of the knights. Among the owners of these castles were many Slovak knights, as it attested to by Slovak names of many citadels — Strečno, Lietava, Likava, Vršatec, Lednica, Hrušov, Hričov, Blatnica, Krásna Hôrka, etc.

Later, rich mining and commercial towns became the most significant centers of culture. The inhabitants of the cities had more of a mind for cultural interests than the

agricultural inhabitants of the villages. This undoubtedly was due to the influence of their occupation and their economic condition. The German settlers of Slovak cities maintained contacts with their fatherland and its higher culture. This "city" culture made itself manifest not only in the city itself, in the architecture of urban homes and public buildings, but also in the life of the people in general. The city dwellers, as merchants and artisans, came into contact with near and distant lands, and adopted the more progressive ways of living. In the cities there were schools (in Bratislava and in Spišská Kapitula already in the thirteenth century), and foreign artisans and artists came to the cities to build and decorate civic structures, especially the parish churches.

At that time several universities were set up in Central Europe after the pattern of the University of Paris. These universities (Prague, 1348; Cracow, 1364; Vienna, 1365) were also attended by students from Slovakia, because the first Hungarian university founded by Louis the Great in Pätkostoly in 1367, had closed its doors. Some of them won high academic honors and became professors at these universities. In this way Slovakia was in contact with higher European culture, the centers of which were the universities.

But most striking is the participation of Slovakia in the contemporary cultural trends in the field of creative art. Gothic art, as it developed in France, Germany and Italy, expressed the loftiness of the Christian spirit which frees itself from the earth and soars into the heights. This idea received expression especially in the building of Gothic churches, which with their height, ease and gracefulness rose high above the surroundings and elevated the thoughts of the believing man to God. This style was adopted in Slovakia already in the middle of the thirteenth century and, in the church structures, blended with the final echoes of the Romanesque style.

An example of early Gothic architecture has been preserved in Slovakia in the church of the former prepositure of Turiec, in Kláštor-pod-Znievom (The Monastery-beneath-Zniev), built about 1260. The Franciscan church in Brati-

slava and the Dominican church in Košice were built at the end of the thirteenth century. Many imposing Gothic churches were erected in the fourteenth century in the thriving cities of Slovakia, among them the parish churches in Bratislava, Levoča, Trnava, Bardejov, Prešov, and, especially, St. Elizabeth's Cathedral in Košice.

Beautiful Gothic temples of worship were also constructed in the Spiš region and the mining cities of Central Slovakia. The Gothic churches of the Slovak monasteries at St. Beňadik, Mariatál, Okoličné, and the church of the Red Monastery (Červený Kláštor) date from that time. Vienna and Prague strongly influenced the development of Gothic art in western Slovakia, while Bratislava and Cracow influenced its growth in Central and Eastern Slovakia.

Besides the great and imposing Gothic churches of the cities, there arose in Slovakia a large number of small village churches, which even in their simplicity and artistic modesty attest that Gothic culture penetrated deeply into medieval Slovakia and left many relics there. While the city churches were, as a rule, designed and built by foreign architects, the small village churches were generally designed and built by native masters, who had adopted the structural characteristics of the Gothic style of architecture.

Besides the ecclesiastical edifices of the city, the medieval castles which ornament the peaks of Slovak mountains are also counted among the relics of Gothic art. Hardly anywhere in Central Europe are there as many castles as in Slovakia. Even this circumstance proves that Slovakia participated in the contemporary growth of Europe. Some of these castles because of their location, size, and structure, are outstanding souvenirs of Gothic architecture. The majority of these castles already has succumbed to the harmful influence of time, but even in the ruins some Gothic gates, windows, high vaults and arches have been preserved in Bratislava, Zvolen, Vígľaš, Strečno, Trenčín, Orava and Spiš.

Only a few Gothic homes have been preserved in the cities, because they had to be removed to make way for newer building developments in later centuries. Remnants

of ancient municipal buildings, city fortifications and Gothic homes are rare; only in Bratislava has a portion of the ancient City Hall been preserved, while Levoča still has a part of its old city wall and a part of a Gothic home. Several examples of stone decorations have also been preserved; especially the reliefs on the portals of the church in Bratislava, Banská Bystrica, Spišská Nová Ves and Košice.

Woodcarving reached a high degree of perfection in Slovakia and many wooden statues of the Madonna, St. Barbara and St. Catherine have been preserved in Spiš and in the mining towns. The wing altars of the churches of Spiš, Šariš and other eastern cities, are among the most valuable memorials of Gothic art in Slovakia. Some wing altars have also been preserved in Banská Bystrica, Štiavnica and other parts of Slovakia. An outstanding wood-carver of that time was Master Paul of Levoča, who made the beautiful altar of the Nativity in Bardejov and the main altar in St. Jacob's church in Levoča. The apprentices of this master artist of Levoča decorated the churches in Spiš with remarkable wood-carvings.

The development of Gothic painting was subject to several influences. In southern Slovakia, where Gothic frescoes were preserved in Chyžné and Štítnik, the Italian influence predominated. In western Slovakia the Italian style came by way of neighboring Austria, while Gothic painting developed in eastern Slovakia under the influence of Silesia. Besides mural frescoes (the oldest painting in the Spišská Kapitula depicts the coronation of Charles Robert and dates back to 1317), many framed paintings on the wing altars have been preserved. Examples of high artistic workmanship, especially religious articles (chalices, monstrances, crucifixes, Mass vestments, etc.) have been preserved in many parish and monastery churches. Many of these relics originated in Slovak workshops which also exported their products. In Spiš bells were poured for churches in Poland.

This great wealth of mementos from the Gothic period shows clearly that Slovakia lived a rich cultural life from the 13th to the 15th century and did not remain behind neighboring cultured countries in the field of creative arts.

Officers of the Slovak League of America

(Organized May 26, 1907, Cleveland, Ohio)

Honorary Presidents

Msgr. F. J. Dubosh, P.A.
12608 Madison Avenue
Lakewood 7, Ohio

Dr. Peter P. Hletko
Batavia Rd., Box 48
Warrensville, Ill.

President

Philip A. Hrobák
P. O. Box 150
Middletown, Pa.

Vice-Presidents

Joseph Bendík
P. O. Box 230
Uniontown, Pa.

Julia Krajčovič
1648 W. 18th Street
Chicago 8, Ill.

Recording Secretary

John Horecký
2264 Walton Ave.
New York 53, N. Y.

Secretary-Treasurer

Milan V. Blažek
4922 S. LeClaire Avenue
Chicago 38, Ill.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Paul P. Jamriška
536 Marie Ave.
Pittsburgh 2, Pa.

Paul C. Kazimer
1122 Sylvan Ave.
Homestead, Pa.

John Janošík

650 Braddock Ave.
Monessen, Pa.

Stephen Dubiel

12210 Detroit Avenue
Lakewood, Ohio

Joseph Steller

2879 N. 44th St.
Milwaukee 10, Wis.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Michael J. Vargovič

National President
First Catholic Slovak Union

Helen Kočan

National President
First Catholic Slovak
Ladies Union

Paul Fallat

National President
Slovak Catholic Sokol

Stephen J. Tkach

National President
Pa. Catholic Slovak Union

Anna Soták

National President
Ladies Pennsylvania
Slovak Catholic Union

John Rozboril

National President
Slovak Catholic Cadet Union

SLOVAK NEWSPAPERS

(Affiliated with the Slovak League of America)

JEDNOTA Middletown, Pa.	SLOVENSKÁ OBRANA Scranton, Pa.	ŽENSKÁ JEDNOTA Cleveland, Ohio
-----------------------------------	--	--

BRATSTVO Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	SLOVENSKÉ NOVINY Cleveland, Ohio	ZORNIČKA Chicago, Ill.
--------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

KATOLÍCKY SOKOL Passaic, N. J.	SVORNOSŤ Whitaker, Pa.	OSADNÉ HLASY Chicago, Ill.
--	----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

SLOVÁK V AMERIKE
Middletown, Pa.



SLOVAKIA: The old castle of Banská Štiavnica (13–16th Cent.)